

2

THE  
LAWFVLNES  
O F  
KNEELING  
IN THE ACT OF  
RECEIVING THE  
LORDS SVPPER.

Wherein (by the way) also, some-  
what of the CROSSE in Baptisme.

*First Written for satisfaction of a  
Friend, and now published for  
Common Benefit.*

---

By D<sup>r</sup>. I O H N B V R G E S , Pastor of  
Sutton Coldfield.

---

L O N D O N ,

Printed by Augustine Matthewes for Robert Milbourne,  
and are to bee sold at his Shop in Pauls Church-  
yard at the Signe of the Grayhound.

I 6 3 1.

---

---

THE  
LAWFAVING  
OR  
KINNEFLING  
IN THE ACT OF  
RECEIVING THE  
TORIES SAPPERS

VALENTIN (PA. MAY) 110, June  
Maple of the Cross is Public.

The Author (PA. MAY) 110, June  
Henry now baptised for  
Conversion before

---

Dr. John Barnes, Pres.  
Saxon College.

London  
Printed by J. & C. White for the  
Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge  
and for the Saxon College.



The Lawfulness of Kneeling in the  
Act of receiving the Lords Supper, first writ-  
ten for the satisfaction of a Friend, and  
now published for common Benefit.

C A P . I.

*The definition of a Ceremony.*

S I R ,



Before I meddle with any your objec-  
tions, or questions concerning our  
Church-Ceremonies, I hold it need-  
full to set downe certayne Heads, to  
which I may referre in answering,  
beginning with the Definition of a  
*Ceremony.*

A *Ceremony* is an outward action  
purposely done in reference to some  
other thing, of the substance whereof it is no cause or part.

1. Thus the recitall of the Creed at Baptisme, is a Cer-  
emony serving to shew, unto what Faith every one is bound  
by the stipulation of Baptisme; whereas the recitall of it  
as a profession of our Faith to the honouring of God, is not  
a *Ceremony*, but an act of religous worship and service to  
God in it selfe, for the substance of it.

2. The terme of *Circumstance* is not so fit for our use, as  
that of *Ceremony*. 1. Because it is more large; for though  
every *Ceremony* be a *Circumstance* of that matter to which  
it ser-

## The lawfulness of Kneeling,

it serveth as a Ceremony; yet is not every circumstance a Ceremony; for, some Circumstances are intrinsecall, and essentiall to actions, and specially making vp their nature. 2. Any casuall thing may be a Circumstance, but to a Ceremony it is essentiall, that it be purposly done.

Ceremonies which we may call Religious, in distinction from merely Civil, are Divine, or Ecclesiastical which wee will call Humane.

3. The Sacraments, as touching the use of the outward Elements, in such maner as is prescribed, are Ceremonies, in relation to the things internal: yet are they of the substance of the Sacrament, quoad externū, in respect of the external part thereof; & because of the divine Institution, the observance thereof is religious worship of God & se, of it selfe. The like be said of the Ceremonies of the Law of Moses, during the Obligation of the Law. Our disquisition is not of such, but onely of such as in suo individuo, in the very particular individuall, are of humane institution, or (which is to vs all one) application.

### C A P. 2.

The meaning of that phrase, [In the worship of God]

Next, wee must state the meaning of this phrase [ in the worship of God.] For it may signify that which is done to God for a piece of worship to him in and of it selfe, as is the blessing, breaking and delivery of the Bread in the Lord's Supper. Thus nothing can lawfully bee vsed or done in the worship of God, more then hee hath prescribed. Otherwise, a thing is done in the worship of God, which is not done as a part of the essentiall worship, but onely as an arbitrary adjunct. Thus we use our Ceremonies.

### C A P. 3.

How our Ceremonies may be called Worship  
of God, and how not.

Wee must also understand one another, when wee affirm or denie our Church Ceremonies to be worship  
of God.

of God, leſt we haue, as S. Aug. speakes, *item interminatum*, an endlesſe controverſie, and ſeeing to affent or diſſent, when wee doe not.

Any act internall or externall, done with intention to honour God thereby, is *Cultus*, worship of God. This done to that which is not God, as if it were God, is Idolatry against the firſt Commandement.

When the honour is intended to the true obiect of religious worship, God, it is either *mediately* done to honour him, as in the duties of the ſecond Table, done in obedience to God; or more *immediately*, as in the duties of the firſt Table, done to God for his honour.

The *imediate* worship of God is either Internall and principall, or externall and ſecondary.

The *internall* conſiſtereth in thoſe actings of the ſoule, which as it were naturally arife out of the true knowledge of God, and may bee reduced to *Dependancie* on him, or *Image* to him.

The *externall* worship of God, is ſome outward action done in relation to the internall worship of God, which giueth ſubſtance to it; and ſo, to the honouring of God.

This externall worship of God is either *false*, when it is framed merely of the will of man, which is the thing forbidden in the ſecond Commandement. Or, wholly according to the will of God, and then is *true* worship externall.

The *true* externall worship of God is ſo, and ſo called *Ratione medijs*, or *modis*, in reſpect either of the *meaneſ*, or *manner* of worship.

In reſpect of the *Meaneſ*, all true worship of God is grounded either on Gods ſpeciall command, to haue ſuch a thing done to him; and this is properly worship *ex ſe*, in and of it ſelſe: Or upon Gods allowance onely, as touching the particular; and this is worship of God *ratione medijs*, as it is a *meaneſ* of performing it: but not *ex ſe*, in and of it ſelſe, but *per alia*, by vertue of ſome thing elſe. Of this ſort are the *bodily gestures*, whereby as by outward ſignes wee profeſſe to giue honour to God, whereof no *particulars* are determined in the Word.

## *The lawfullnesse of Kneeling.*

*2. Cor. 14. 26,  
40.*

In respect of the *Manner*, the externall worship of God consisteth in the reverend vsage of his prescribed worship, and is contained in those rules of the Apostle, *Let all things bee done to edification, according to order and decoucie.* And to this belongs the third Commandement; which forbidding all irreverent vse of Gods Name in his Titles or Ordinances, commandeth the contrary in generall.

*D. Ames. Me-  
dull. part. 2.  
cap. 14. subf. 23.*

Now because God hath not particularly prescribed those externall Rites which belong to the *manner* of his outward service; therfore the same are not properly, and in themselves religious worship. And yet because the *Genus*, or generall nature of them, *Order* and *Decoucie*; and *immediatē end*, the *edification* of men is commanded, therefore *reduictively*, and in their generall nature, in respect of their *vnitend*, which is the honouring of God, they must bee vouchsafed, in that sense and notion, the title of *Divine worship*. And in this sense we affirme our *Ceremonies* to be *worship* of God, otherwise denie them to be worship.

Onely I would haue it considered, that the same humane Ceremony which hath *rationem modi*, respect vnto the *manner*, may haue also *rationem modi*, the respect of a *means* in worship; but not *modi per se*, of a means of and by it selfe, as namely, *kneeling* in prayer. That this distinction may appeare not to be devised for a shifte, I will (in a Chapter by it selfe) confirme it by *Witnesses*, and otherwise.

## *C A P. 4.*

*The same exemplified by Instances in divers  
other particulars.*

*Luke 2.37.*

*T. C. Answ to  
the Rheuists.*

**T**HIS the Scripture confirmeth, when it saith, that *Ha-  
nab served God night and day, in fasting and prayer.* It is plaine therefore, that her so frequent *fasting* was a service of God, and not onely her *Prayers*. And yet not a service as her *Prayers*, in and of it selfe, it not being so commanded of God, but as a thing in generall commanded; and in that particular manner allowed onely, because it did, as M<sup>r</sup>. *Cartwright* saith, give a speedier wing vnto Praier: and it was an act

act of religious worship, yea and a *means* of it, not in and of it selfe, but *per aliquid*, by another thing, or *proper aliquid*, for another thing: yet it was worship in some sense, or else Saint Luke was deceived.

The second Commandement (saith M. Cartwright) condemning all will-worship, requireth that we worship God <sup>p. 96. with 98.</sup> *as himselfe hath commanded or allowed in his Word:* <sup>and p. 100. 102.</sup> which are also the words of Bullinger. The same M. Cartwright divideth the Worship of God into *Substantiall* and *Circumstantiall*. The *Circumstantiall* hee placeth in bodily gestures, accommodated to the severall acts of instituted worship: *God*, then (in his judgement) there is a worship which is *commanded in particular*, which is *Substantiall*: and there is a worship which is *onely allowed* in the particular, (though commanded in *genere suo*, in his kind) which is but *Circumstantiall*; and what is this, but a worship which is so properly, in and of it selfe, and a worship which is not so simply in and of it selfe, which to the other is an *adjunct*, not a part of it.

Thus Chamber, To. 3. lib. 20. cap. 5. saith of *Venes arbitrarie*, that they are *Cultus Dei non per se, sed per accidentes, & proper aliquid*, Worship of God, not of themselves, but by accident, and for some other thing.

Thus Iunius in Bellar. Cons. 7. cap. 10. an. 13. saith, *Parem esse cultus Dei ambiguè dicuntur. Si propte interpreteris falsum est enunciatum*, That it is a part of divine worship, is ambiguously said: If you meane properly, the assertion is false. (*viz.* which said that the observation of the Anniversary feasts of the *Nativitie* and *Easter*, &c. was *par cultus divini*, part of divine worship:) for (saith Iunius) *Accidentis contingens non est rei pars, sed adiunctum dicendum*: A contingent accident is not to bee termed a part of a thing, but an adjunct: *si figurata, nulla est consequentia*, if it be spoken figuratively, there is no consequence in it, *viz.* to proue that the Church might make Lawes binding the conscience of and by themselves, as Gods Lawes doe, which constitute proper necessary worship.

Thus Polanus, who (in *Synagmata*) defineth the true wor-

*Synag. p. 328.*

6  
*The lawfulness of Kneeling,*

See also Pag.  
232, 233,  
234.

ship of God to bee the performance of what hee hath commanded in obedience to him to his honour: yet in his *Partitions* printed at London, 1591. pag. 128. hee saith, that *An Ecclesiastical Rite or Ceremony is outward Worship of God, Quod Deum externe colitur, whereby he is outwardly worshipped, not forgetting or crossing himselfe; but taking the name of Worship in the one properly considered, and improperly or substantively in the other; in which sense he in the other places calleth the Institution and Observance of Holy dayes, Worship.*

*Theol. printed  
at Lond. 1613.  
pag. 383.*

M<sup>r</sup>. Fennermaketh bowing of the kace or head, modulation of the voyce, lifting vp of the hands or eyes, to bee parts of the externall worship of God: which M<sup>r</sup>. Cartwright (in his *Catechisme on the second Commandement*) calleth *Circumstantiall worship*, in distinction to that which hee calleth *Substantiall*.

*Tilenus in Syntag.* printed at Soden, 1613. pag. 383. saith, that a vow of a thing commanded, is *cultus Dei per se*, worship of God in and of it selfe; but of a thing not commanded, is *cultus Dei per accidentem*, worship of God by accident onely.

Bucan. *Institut.* pag. 566. saith, That Ecclesiastical Rites may not be deemed or taken to be worship of God *per se*, & ex *opere operato*, of themselves, and as a worke done.

Melancthon in *Corporo Theol.* printed 1571. pag. 719: having shewed that no man may institute any worship of God, addeth, i. e. Workes that God so alloweth, that hee holdeth himselfe to bee honoured in them, *ex se*, of themselves. And pag. 52. *Opera*, Workes whose immediate end is, that God may bee honoured [*per illa*] by them.

This difference of worship which is simply necessary, *ratione praecepti*, & *medij ex se*, in respect of precept, and as a meane of it selfe, and of worship, *ratione medijs*, as a meane, *non praecepti*, *sed probati*, not commanded, but allowed, must be acknowledged in sundry actes of holy men reported in *Scriptures*, as also that difference of *medium*, & *modus cultu*, of a *meanes*, and *manner* of worship. For in the Free-will offerings, when a man was left at libertie to offer a bullocke,

locke, goat, or sheepe at his pleasure; if bee chose a bullocke to offer, that sacrifice in that particular, was not commmanded, but onely allowed. Indeed the Manner, because it was prescribed, was *Culm sub precepto necessarium*, worship by precept made necessary. *Solomons* peace offerings of 22000 bullocks, and 120000 sheep, at the Dedication of the Temple, and burning some of the Sacrifices on the Brasen Altar, and some on the floore of the Court; and his Prayer, kneeling on a scaffold, with his hands stretched out to heauen, were all worship of God; but not all of the same Consideration: For sacrifice to God was then necessary *ex precepto*, by vertue of a commandement; the number of bullocks and sheep, was worship *ex fine*, in respect of the end, & of allowance onely: his prayer was worship *ex se*, of it selfe; the Ceremonies of it, worship *reductio ad modum in genere suo*, having respect to the manner in the generall kind thereof: the burning on the Altar was necessary *in se*, in it selfe; that in the Court onely lawfull, before the brasen Altar was consecrated (which was but then *in fieri*, in the making) and vp, on the present necessitie.

That Princes should hold Gods people to him, was of command, and necessary, but that *Joshua* should endeauour it by the *Monitory stone* set vp at <sup>a</sup> *Shechem*, (<sup>b</sup> *Asa* by an oak, <sup>c</sup> *Nehemiah* by subscription) was onely of allowance, not of precept, and worship to God, not *per se*, of it selfe, but *proper aliud*, in reference to some other thing, and *ex fine ultimo*, with respect to the vtmost end.

The like is to be said of *Solomons* 14 dayes of Solemnitie vsed to the honouring of God, at the Dedication of the Temple <sup>d</sup>: *Hezekiahs* and his Princes deligation of 7 dayes <sup>e</sup> more <sup>f</sup>: *Mordecaies Purim* dayes <sup>f</sup>, and a number such like, in which there was certainly some worship of God intended, but not simply and in the things themselves, as in the observation of the Sabbath day, but reductively and *proper aliud*, in reference to some other thing, which was the soule of this worship.

This wil shew in what sense we may call our Ceremonies worship of God, and in what meaning wee deny them to be worship,

And:

<sup>a</sup> King. 8. &c. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Chro. 6. &c. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Isai. 24. 2.

<sup>b</sup> 2 Chron.

15. 14.

<sup>c</sup> Nche. 9. v. 14.

10. 1.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Kin. 8. 65.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Chron.

30. 25.

<sup>f</sup> Hester 9.

Bell. To. 4.  
col 1425.

Com. in Col.  
2. 23.

And this will shew the difference betwixt vs and the Papists, for they professe all these Ceremonies to bee a part of the Divine worship, yet necessary and meritorious, such as even *extra easum scandali & contemptu*, without the case of scandal and contempt, saith Bellar. cannot be omitted without sinne, which is indeed to pronounce them divine worship in themselves: whereas wee say with Zanchie, *That whatsoever is added to the worship of God delivered in his Word, added (I say) by men as part of divine worship, is Will-worship; that is, as hee there also saith of Traditions of men, wherewith the consciences of men are bound, and which are ioyned with an opinion of divine worship and merit.*

### C A P. 5.

#### *What is meant by Matters of meere Order.*

**T**He next consideration may be of these words, *Matters of meere order*. For *Order* is sometimes taken strictly in opposition to *Confusion*; and as so, is a distinct thing from *decency*. Thus it is vsed, 2 Cor. 14.40. in which sense *Order* is but the timing, & placing of each thing afore or after other.

*De Polit. Ec-  
clesiast. pag. 1.*

But *Order* is sometimes so largely taken, as to comprehend the disposition and manner of handling any ordinance of God, and is as large (saith M. Parker) as *Policy*, and taken *Pro disciplina tota*, for the whole discipline, to Col. 2.5. And so Paul vseth the verbe, 1. Cor. 11. vte. *Other things will I order when I come.*

Yet wee take it not so very largely *Pro disciplina tota*, for the whole discipline in respect of the essentials thereof, prescribed of God to remaine in perpetuity, and not vnder the Churches dispose.

Whatsoever therefore in the worship of God, or gouernment of the Church, is not Essentiall or Divine, but may bee varied and disposed of, according to the generall rules of the Word; that wee call *Matter of meere Order* in Contradistinction to matter of *Simple Necessity*, whereto the Conscience is bound; because in these things, nothing but *Obedience* is left to the Church; but, a power of *Disposing* (which

is to Order) is left to her in those things, to doe (according to the generall rules of the Word) therein, whatsoever saith Master Calvin, *The necessity of the Church shall require*. That is, for Peace, Safety, Profit, Edification, and Advantage in spirituall things.

Order in the strict sense, admits (as the Replier to Bp. Merton saith) no New thing, but onely the disposing of things ordained in time and place. But Order, in the large sense, admitteth all such things vnprescribed as belong to the Churches seruice, and furtherance in the seruice of God, and as Melancthon saith, *ad ornandum ordinem*, to adorne order.

In this larger sense it is *civitatis*, good or comely order, and thus Iunius taketh it, when, to Bellarmine objecting the Feast of Purim appointed by Mordecas, to p'oue thereby that the Church may make Lawes proprij nominis, properly so called, which in themselves doe bind the conscience : Iunius answereth, *Præceptum fuit politicum*, (that is, as the Replier translateth it, *It was a Precept of order :*) Iunius addes, \* *Non sequitur ex dispari*, But that which Bellarmine would thence inferre, being of a different nature, followes not. *Nec que enim negamus suam Ecclesiam politiam esse, sed imperium per se obligans conscientiam*. Nor doe wee deny the Church her pollicy ; but onely her imperiall authority, that of it selfe binds the conscience.

Thus Doctor Whitaker taketh it when hee saith, that *All which the Church may determine off, belongeth ad civitatis, to good order*, and by this he putteth off afterwards Bellars objections, as Iunius doth.

Thus the August. confession. Artic. 7. de Abusibus. *Daco-  
muni pastores Ecclesiarum posse in Ecclesiis suis publicos ritus in-  
stituere, sed tantum ad finem corporalem, h. e. bene ordinis causa,  
viz. ritus utiles ad docendum multitudinem, ut certas dies, certae  
lectiones, & siqua sunt similia ; Sed sine superstitione, & sine  
opinione necessitatis, ut has ordinationes violare, extra easum  
scandalis, non ducatur esse peccatum, &c.* We teach that Pastors  
of Churches may institute publicke rites in their Churches,  
but only to a corporall end, that is, for good orders sake  
viz. rites profitable to teach the people, as namely cer-  
tains

*Iun. animad.  
in Bellar. de  
cultu sancto.  
lib. 3. cap. 10.  
annex. 13.  
Repl. I. pars.*

\* *ibid. annos.*  
34.  
*De Rom. Pont.*  
pag. 841. &c.

taine dayes (to be obserued) certaine lessons (to be read) and such like : but without superstition, and without opinion of necessity ; and that it shoulde not be accounted sinne to violate these ordinances, vniuersall in the case of scandall which might follow thereupon.

*In his. 4. cap. 10.  
fol. 25.*

For as Master Calvin saith, *when a Law is once knownen to be made publicke honestatis causa, iam sublata est omnis Superstitione,* for publicke comelincesse sake, all Superstition is taken away from it : and when it is knowne, *Ad communem usum speare, eversa est falsa illa obligationis & necessitatis opinio, &c.* To looke at common use or benefit, that false opinion of obligation and necessity, is overthrowne and remoued.

Whatsoever therefore is ordained in the Church, as an Arbitrary and moveable Rite or Ceremony, in the use whereof no Immediate or proper worship of God is placed, but the thing in it selfe still reckoned to bee indifferent ; that is a matter of meere Order, *sensu largo,* in the large acceptation of Order.

### C A P. 6.

#### *The scope of the second Commandement.*

**T**O these I will adde something about the scope of the second Commandement.

The scope of the second Commandement is, by forbidding all will-worship, vnder the vnuall and grossest kind of it, to inioyne and tye vs to such meanes and wayes of worshipping God, as himselfe hath commanded or allowed, as Master Cartwright saith.

Whatsoever therefore is forbidden in this Commandement, is either *Directly* forbidden, or only by *Consequence.*

1. Things *Directly* forbidden, I call such as are Prohibited either *Expressely*, or *Analogically*, as it were in *recta linea*, in a direct line.

2. In *Expresse termes*, two things. 1. The making of any Image or similitude (not *simply*, but) to be a representation of a God-head to vs in the Essence, Properties, Speciall presence, or Dispensation of grace thereby. Of which the

rea-

reason is, that all such fanfied representations, speake nothing but lies of the God-head. 2. The tendering of any service or honour to God, so much as outwardly, at, in and-by such an Image made by the only will of man: all which service though by man intended to God, yea though to the true God, yet falleth short of him, and resteth in the Image, as if it were only done to it; therefore is it said, *Then shall we know thy selfe so them, nor serve them.*

2. Analogically, are forbidden: First, all false Imaginations and conceits of the God-head, in respect of his Being, Presence, Dispensation of grace, or will. For all these doe falsifie the true God to vs, as doth an Image or outward shape, made for representation of him, at mans pleasure. And secondly, the Substitution or vse of any wayes and meanes of serving God, merely after the will of man, i.e. which God hath not either commanded in particular, or at least allowed in Generall.

2. By Consequence, all such things, as doe prouoke necessarily, vnto the breach of this Precept, are here forbidden.

On the contrary wee are inioyned to receive such (as I may say) Images or representations, as God himselfe shall institute for declaration of his presence, Glory, Grace, or Will. For as Doctor Ames<sup>+</sup> well saith, *nibi, in [non facies + Modul. lib. 2. cap. 13. Thos. 1.]* tibi] is not redundant as sometimes it is, but Emphaticall to shew that God restraineth men from doing that which hee reserveth to himselfe alone in that matter. And secondly he requireth all due respect and reverent Adoration, to be performed to himselfe, by such wayes and meanes as himselfe hath either Commanded in particular, or in particular allowed, by commanding the Generall kind, to which that particular belongeth. And by Consequence hee requireth such meanes to bee vsed as may further vs in this true worship of him.

C. A. P.

## C A P . 7 .

Of the Termes of Service, Worship, Adoration  
and Veneration.

**V**WE sometimes vse these termes promiscuously and insifferently, yet is there a difference betwixt some and others of them. For Service is more large then Adoration or Veneration, which is Worship in our language. All Adoration is Service, but all Service of God is not Adoration, or Veneration.

ברך כדור כרע חשתחוּת 2. The Iewes had no word which directly answereth to Adoration, but vse the Termes which signifie some bowing, whether of the knee, head, backe; or prostration of the whole body, grouelling on the belly, and face to the ground. Hence in the Commandement; *Thou shalt not bow downe,* which is to say, thou shalt not worship nor adore them, nor Serue them, *nec coles.*

Adoration therefore, and Veneration or Worship, strictly and properly vnderstood, signify such Gestures and comportment of the body, as serue for a signe and expression of Internall esteeme and respect of that, to which these expressions referre. And yet are the wordes applyed and translated sometimes to Angels or other Creatures which can make no bodily expressions; And sometimes to the inward reverence of the Heart, because the same is vniually amongst men, expressed by some bodily signes.

3. The outward Adoration consisteth in bodily signes, but the Service of God stands not in them simply. Hence our Divines rightly deny any humane Ceremonies to bee partes *cultus seu in se*, parts of worship to wit in themselves, but onely adjuncts to essentiall or proper worship, i.e. Service of God, who yet grant them to be parts of the externall Adoration: which externall Adoration is not *Cultus in suo Individuo*, worship in the particular individuall, because not prescribed; but onely *in suo genere*, in the generall kind of it, and as it leaneth vnto some other service of God, to which it serueth as matter of Decency, or Order, which God hath in Generall required.

5. The

5. The outward Expressions of Adorations never were devised or instituted of God, but taken from the customary usage of men, which generally did vse some or other as bending and bowing in signe of respect, reverence or honour one towards another. And yet all the world never agreed in one fashion of shewing respect. But haue pleased themselves in severall wayes.

The men of *Iepaliate* one another by putting off their *shooses*; as they of *China* by putting off their *hatts* one to another, as wee doe.

See. Heylins  
History of the  
World. Edit. 4  
pag 686. 734.  
739. 805.

In *Ethiopia* the Subjects sit in the presence of their King in signe of Subiection, because Standing before him is there a token of greatest dignity.

The Negroes giue signe of reverence to their King by sitting on their buttocks with their Elbowe on their knees, and hands on their faces, as not worthy to looke on him.

They of the Islands called *Bucalaos* shew their highest reverence to their King by rubbing their noses, and foreheads in his presence; perhaps to signifie their itching after his fauour.

Kissing of the King, was with the Iewes a signe of Homage, and subiection with loue. Hence, they kissed *Saul*. 1 Sam. 10. 1. Hence that phrase, \* *Kisse the Sonne*: and from that recei- \* Psal. 2. 12. ved formalitie, came in Adoration of their representatiue gods, by kissing them: As, *Kisse the Calves*, in *Hosea*; and *Hos. 13. 2.* thus in *Job*, *If my heart haue kissed my hand in secret, for, if I Job 31.27.* haue so much as in my minde intended to worship the Moone. And from this, kissing of the Emperor or his garments, and so of the Idols in reference to their Deities, came the Latine word *Adoratio*, and not from bowing or kneeling, as some haue obserued.

The Iewes adored in prayer, with their heads and faces covered, in signe of awfull reverence; wee, by being vncouered.

Some Nations worshipped sitting on beds before their Idols, as \* *Tertull. sheweth*. And by the same reason by which \* *Zib. de Osi. Altare Damascenum* saith, that sitting crosse-legged, as the *rations*. *Turkes* doe at their meales, should be amongst them (if they were converted) a comely fashion of receiving the Lords Supper;

Supper; by the same, any of the former fashions in the Nations above-said, should bee comely expressions of giving honour to God, because by vse and construction amongst them, they are vnderstood for signes of giving honour.

## C A P. 8.

*That Adoration and Veneration differ not,  
but by mens wills.*

**A**doration and Veneration have no formall difference betwixt themselves, either from the nature of the words, or common vsage of them; much lesse by any Scripture-limitation. Onely, because there is a difference of the supreme honour due alone and aboue all to God, and that which in an inferiour degree, is allowed to Gods excellent Ordinances or Creatures, some men doe suppose such a difference in these words: which yet is really no more in the words themselves, then the twelue Signes in the Zodiacke. Nor is this distinction any better then that of *συλεια*, and *λατρεια*, by which men suppose a distinction of the Divine and supreme worship proper to God, and that inferiour regard which may bee shewed to the Creatures. In which the difference is just, as in casting Counters, wherein one is but one penny, another stands for one shilling, a third for one pound, without any difference made in the Counters themselves.

## C A P. 9.

*Of Divine and Civill Adoration.*

**A**s Adoration, and Veneration differ not in the words, but onely by the intendments of men in vsing them; So Adoration of God is not differenced by any outward expressions, which men vse in token of honour from Civill Adoration; but either by the intention of the minde, or by the ordinance of man. Hence it is, that we find all the same words which import bowing of the knee, head, trunke, or prostration on the face, familiarly given to such reverence, as was thereby signified, as well in civill respects vnto men,

as

as religiously unto God in his worship. And it is well observed by Buxtorfius, that *she Jewes knew, or had no outward gesture which was appropriated to divine Adoration*, save onely prostration with their feet and hands spread and splayed out, as in a swimming frog, which might not bee vsed any where, *so nor in Gods worship*, save onely in the *Sanctuarie*. And this was made a distinctive signe of supreme *Adoration* or *Veneration*, onely by the appointment and intendement of it. They are therefore much deceived, that thinke *Kneeling* to bee any more a signe of *Divine adoration*, then other expressions of *Veneration*, as sitting bare-headed, though with vs it is a signe of greater respect then the other. But there are in *Divine*, as well as *Civill veneration*, divers degrees of intension, which vary not the kind one from another.

C. A. P. 10.

*Whether Kneeling bee any Divine Adoration by divine Injunction, or Application of it to true Divine Worship.*

1. The last thing to be considered, is, that God hath not Pag. 88. and fixed the gesture of *Kneeling* to any one act or other 783. & 809. of his own exterrnall worship or service, as *Aitare Damascenum* rightly observeth; no not to Prayer. For as for those words, *Psal. 95.5. O come let vs worship*, i. e. prostrate and bow downe our selues, and kneele before the *Lord our Maker*, it is not a *Precept*, as that Author of *Ait. Damasc.* faith, but an *Exhortation*: and doth (lay I) no more prooue that God required it necessarily in any act of his solemne worship, then those words, [*Praise him in the daunces.*] and [*O clap your hands,*] or [*Shout out for joy,*] doe prooue, that God required them to dance in his solemne praises, to clap hands or shout. Onely it is true, that such Exhortations shew, that these were allowed of God, as they were vsed of godly men in his solemne Service, as expressions of joy in honouring of God.

2. And if that Scripture did intend an *Injunction preceptive* for *Kneeling*, yet no more then for bowing or falling flat,

B

which

which we translate *worship*. And if all those had been insti-  
tuted gestures of religious worship in the Temple, by virtue  
of that Exhortation, yet should not this of *Kneeling* bee  
assigned to any act of religious service more then other, leav-  
ing all those three are put together conjunctly; *Lay v-*  
*worship*, *Bow downe*, and *Kneele*, *the which will manifestly*  
*prove, that they were all three indifferently used, and to bee*  
*vied in any duties of worship, when they came before God,*  
*and meant to express their holy reverence of their God.*

3. Whence also it was, that (as *Augusti obserueth*) the  
holy servants of God, publikely or privately, even in prayer  
it selfe, sometimes stood, as did the Publican and Pharisees,  
who are blotted, not for standing in *Prayer*, but for praying  
to be *seen of man*. Some say reverently before the Lord, as  
*David*, 2. *Sam.* 7. though commonly they vsed to *kneele*, or  
*bow themselves downe*. As also that they vsed all three sorts  
of bowing, or exterrall *Adoration*, both occasionally vpon  
any extraordinary message, or other signall of Gods presence  
or favour; or ordinarily in the severall acts of his worship, as  
well as kneeling in any of them, with free conscience, be-  
cause God in his wisdome had spared to enjoyne any one or  
other set fashion of exterrall gesture as fixed to the free-  
hold; God providing that hee which could not performe  
the gesture, might yet performe the seruice, yea and Adora-  
tion to him by such expreſſions as hee could well vſe; as  
*David Adored in his bed*, 1. *King.* 1.47; And that the con-  
sciences of men might not be snared by such a necessity; nor  
occasion given to superstition in matters of that Quality.

4. Neither are they well aduised which will needs haue  
*Kneeling* a gesture of religious Adoration, because it is as  
they say, a signe of the greatest reverence or humbling of  
our selues; For if bowing the head and backe, be not grea-  
ter, yet surely prostration flat on the ground was: For as  
*Saint Augustine* saith, *Hee that toucheth the earth with his*  
*knees may goe lower, but so cannot hee, who toucheth it*  
*with his belly and face*. And yet euē that gesture of pros-  
tration was vsed in giuing ciuill honour and respect to men,  
and not onely in Adoration to God, as hath beeene laid.

5. Where-

5. Wherefore, as Calvin saith of *Kneeling in prayer it selfe*, *Inst. 4.10.39.*  
that though God have not prescribed it in particular, yet in  
as much as it is a part of that Decrees which God requi-  
reth in his worship. It is so humane that wee may also call  
it divine: even so say wee of any gesture which is knowne  
to be a signe of reverence and respect.

And vnalesse wee shall graunt this, wee will bee driven to  
say, that they did not Adore the Idoll that kisst the Calues,  
as did they that bowed the knee to Baal; nor they that lifted  
vp their eyes or hands to the Idols of the Mountaines, as  
well as the man that bowed and humbled himselfe. Nor  
may wee any more say (as others haue truly done) that  
*Homerius* the third was the first man that decreed *Adorati-*  
*on to the Sacrament it selfe*, because hee onely decreed that  
men should reverently bow themselves to the Sacrament  
(not in receiving it, but) when it (after the Consecration)  
was elevated by the Priest, or carried in the streets. For this  
bowing (belike) was no gesture of *Adoration*, being vsually  
done in Civil reverence to men. Only kneeling is Adoration.

Yea, and hence will follow, that neither Pope, nor Mass-  
priest adores either Christ or the Sacrament in the act of  
receiving, seeing the Pope, for state, receives it sitting, & the  
Mass-priest, by the *Causa* of the Mass, *resuenter stans ad*  
*Altare*, reverently standing: Nay, that they which refuse  
to receive this Sacrament *Kneeling*, and will either stand, or  
sitt beheaded reverently, yet they *Adore* not Christ him-  
selfe or God in partaking the Sacrament, because they use  
not that which is the proper gesture of *Divine Adoration*,  
as they say, *Kneeling*.

6. That Christ the sonne of the living God is to be Ado-  
red both Internally and Externally, out of the Sacrament,  
and in the Sacrament, though not as contained in the Ele-  
ments, or existent *quondam corpus*, bodily in the place where  
was the substance of Bread and Wine, as they speake, hee  
is not a Christian that doubteth, as *Chamier* well saith. But  
*An maior cultus propter Ritum?* Is the worship of him the  
greater for the outward Ceremonies? hee meaneth by the  
Question, that without question it is not. But it must bee

Ordo Bon.

greater; if this gesture were only a gesture of Adoration and none other which we are altogether equal with it for signification of highest reverence. I adde, that by this Divinity a man may be bare-handed or put off his hat, or make courtesy, or bend his body to the very Sacrament it selfe, without any reference of those signes of reverence to God or Christ, and yet commit no idolatry, because he doth not give to them any Divine respect; or Adoration, in as much as hee doth not *Kneele*; which were a strange Paradox to bee taught.

7. Finally, I would have men consider, to what extremity (not so much ignorance, as) the desire of victory hath carried these men, who taking *Kneeling* to bee an instituted Ordinance of God, annexed to some duties of his externall worship; doe complaine of our translating of Gods owne ordinances out of their proper place, by applying the vse of *Kneeling* to the receipt of the Sacrament, comparing this to that Impiety of *Ieroboam*, who translated the worship of God from *Jerusalem* to *Dan* and *Besbell*, and altered the day and moneth of Gods holy Feast, to another moneth and day devised of his owne heart; As if they had, or could make it plaine, that God had nailed kneeling to prayer, or to some other of his seruices, as wee are sure that God had confined all Sacrifice-worship, to the place that hee had then chosen to place his name there, and vtterly disallowed his people to alter the times of any his prefixed solemnities. Now comes wee to the Arguments.

### C A P. XI.

#### *The first Argument against Kneeling answered.*

Arg. I. **N**o humane Ceremonies which are more then matters of meeke order, may lawfully be vsed in the worship of God.

But some of our Church-ceremonies are more then matters of meeke Order. Therefore some of our Ceremonies cannot lawfully bee vsed in the worship of God.

*Answe.*

*Answ.* What wee intend by these words used in the Wor-  
ship of God, hath beene set downe, in Cap. 3. and also what  
different notion there is of the word Order, Cap. 5. Accor-  
ding to which I answer, That if you understand Order in  
the strictest sense, the Minor is true, but the Major is false;  
For then, no humane Ceremony which tendeth properly to  
Decorum, should be lawfull; which is contrary to the Text,  
1. Cor. 14.40. which requireth all things to bee done *Becomingly* or *Decently*, not onely according to Order. But  
if Order be taken in the larger sense, as it ought, then is the  
Major true but the Minor false, which saith that *any* of our  
Ceremonies (viz. in the Churches Intendence and use of them)  
are more then masters of *meere Order*. Let vs try that by the  
Argument brought to proue the Minor.

*Wholesomer ceremonies are instituted and used so stirre up  
men in respect of their signification, unto the remembrance of their  
Duties to God, as in such use masters of more then mere Order.  
But such is the intended use of some of our ceremonies (as is plaine  
in that Publicke declaration of Ceremonies in expresse words  
affirming somuch:) Therefore some of them may not lawfully  
bee used, &c.*

*t* *Answ.* I confess the Minor to bee true of some our Ce-  
remonies; but deny the Major Proposition which supposeth  
the use of a Rite or Ceremony for Signification, to bee more  
then matter of *meere Order*, when it is not imposed or ob-  
served as operative, or as necessary to bee observed as a ser-  
vice of God in it selfe, or binding the conscience *Ex se* of it  
selfe, but with a free conscience. For this can be esteemed  
but a matter of *meere Order sensu largo*, in a large tense:  
The Major therefore is faulty by opposing things Coor-  
dinate, as if they were opposite. I shew it in the like.

*Bellarmino* would proue that the Church may make  
lawes to bind the conscience, the obseruation whereof shall  
bee a proper worship of God. To this end he thus dispu-  
teth: The Christian Churches obserued the Aniuersary  
feasts of Christ's Nativity and Resurrection &c. not for Or-  
der, but as *Commemorative Ceremonies for Commemoration*

*Iunius quo su-  
pro. Annos. 17*

of those benefits which by the Birth and Resurrection of Christ come to vs. To this *Iunius* answers, *Opponit malo,  
qua coordinate sunt, hec doth ill in making those things op-  
posite which are coordinate.* Apply this Answer, and take it, For whatsoeuer about the worship of God is appointed by the Church, not for proper worship to God, nor as any Operative thing, but as a *meere Rite and Ceremony*, it can bee no more then matter of *meere Order*. And whether the same beare any signification or no, is to that point of *Order*, neither too nor twayne, but only an adjoyned vse of the thing Ordered.

The obseruation of the *Purim* feast, was to edifie, by the signification. This the very name of *Purim* and *Sel-dayes* of that moneth, in which God had deliuered them from Hamans lot cast vpon their liues, doth witnesse. Yet faith *Iuni-  
nius* as wee haue heard *It was a precept of Order*.

The Altar which *Moses* set vp not for Sacrifice, but for a Monument, which hee inscribed *Lebona-nissi*, was for Edification of Gods people by the Signification. And so was *Sa-  
muels stone* called, *b Eben-ezer*, And *Iosuabs* stone called *c Edd*, and the womans *d veile*, *e Lone-feasts*, and *f kisse* of *Peace*, with others named before, cap 7. So their going vp to the Temple with a *Piper* in token of their joy, and *dann-  
cing* before the *Lord* at the Feast of Tabernacles, and hundreds more, which the Iewes, as *M<sup>r</sup>. Ainsworth* in his notes on *Levit.* sheweth out of the Rabbines, obserued in Gods wor- ship, and yet all these were but matters of *meere Order*, as was the Altar by *Jordan, Politicum*, a politicall ordinance.

*Conc. Nic. I.*

*Disput. of  
Kneeling.  
Paraus.*

*Pet Mart in  
3 King. 19.13.  
Ainsw. An. in  
Rev. 19.30.*

The like is to bee said of standing in prayer on all the Lords dayes, and the dayes twixt Easter and Whitsuntide in re- ference to the memory of Christs Resurrection, which continued in the Church 1200. yeares. Dipping thrice in Baptisme. And the Iewes *conering* of their heads and faces in prayer, to signifie their vnworthiness to appeare before the Lord. Putting off their shoes when they came to the Sanctuary (as it were a place of holy ground) which God commanded them, *Lev. 19*, for reurence. And turning their faces

faces in their Synagogues toward the Chest, in which they laid the booke of the Law, in relation no doubt to the Arke of the Couenant. All were significant Rites, and (while vsed without Superstition) lawfull, and only matter of mere Order, not of Necessity or for Conscience sake *in se*, in themselves to be obserued. Wherefore I conclude, of the Maior Proposition, *Male opponit que coordinata sunt*, it ill makes opposite things coordinate. And it is as one should say, hee that beside a pitch-brande, doth raddle the heads of his fat sheepe, doth more then marke them : for though the raddle doth signifie more then the brand alone, namely the fatnesse of those sheepe, yet is it no more then a marke, though of another kind, and to another particular vse, over and beyond the pitch marke. And in truth it seemeth to mee very strange, that men who yeeld (as Doctor Ames doth) that the generall rule of all externall Circumstances, which serue to Order and Decency is, *that eo modo ordinantur qui maxime facit ad edificationem*, they be so ordered as may make most vnto edification, i. Cor. 14.26. Should decime it a fault in Ceremonies, that besides their simple respects to Order and Decency, they yeeld by their very Signification some helpe to the Edification of men. Sure I am that Peter Martyr, Burner and Zanchie doe judge the vse of the Surplice to be *eo nomine*, the better, because by the very Colour it is apt to yeeld some good signification. And although (as the Arch-bishop Doctor Whitegife, saith) our Church doth not so impose it as significant, yet if it did, it might be as well defended, as the Ceremony of sitting at the Lords table, in token of our Cobear-ship and familiar fellowship with Christ, as the Dispenser and Altare Damiscenum would haue it received : Or, in token of our Eternall rest to come with Christ in heaven, as *Ioannes de Alasco ple deth fort*.

It may be demanded why then we haue blamed and cast off so many of the Popish Symbolicall Rites. I answer,

1. Because of their Numerositie : for though some such (as Calvin faid) are *adminiculum utile*, a profitable helpe to the weaker fort, yet many doe incumber ; as a weake man

*Medull. part. 2.  
cap. 14. Thes.  
21. 22.*

*Ans. to the  
Admonition.  
pag. 291.*

man may bee holpen with two crutches, but hindred with three or foure: and more, with more.

2. Because, in sundry of them, they laboured to expresse the Mysteries and Historie of the Gospele, as *Brentius* objecteth, which was (as I may say) to shut out the cleare Sun-light, and set vp a little candle: or, at the best, to set vp a Candle where the Sunne shineth, to give light.

3. Sundry of them, (as the Churches Declaration of Ceremonies saith) were utterly vnprofitable, and others darke and dumbe.

4. Many of them consisted in the vse of consecrated Creatures, consecrated (as *Bellarmino* saith) to signific and effect supernaturall effects; which was to put vpon them the very nature of Sacraments.

5. Because they placed (as *Calvin* saith) *ipissimum Deum*, the very worship of God it selfe in the vse of them. But that they were not refused for the very reason of significans alone, appeareth both by the practise of all Churches, which retaine some or others of that kinde, as the Feasts of the *Nativitie*, and *Easter*: And Iudgements; for all that ever I saw, professedly allow some such; as namely, dipping vnder the water in Baptizing, as more significant then sprinckling; and euен the vse of the *Crosse*, as a meere significant Rite, as at the first vsage, yea and *Kneeling* at the Communion, as a token of godly reverence, which in all times before the Doctrine of the Reall presence, *Bree* himselfe judgeth to haue been of lawfull and profitable vse. And the Treatise called, *Dialecticon Eucharistia*, printed at Geneva, and set out with *Bree* his Workes and liking, saith, it might also bee now well reserved, when the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church is restored. And this the *Dutch* and *French* Churches doe professedly allow, never thinking it either *unlawfull*, or *inconvenient* because of the *signification*, or more then a matter of *Order*; for they profess to leaue all Churches, (as, say they, *is fit*) to their owne liberties therein. All the exception which any of them taketh, is from respect of some *inconveniences* which they supposed it to bee subject

*Perkins.*  
*Zanib.*

*vncos:*

vnto; which are not such but that Master Cartwright him-selfe resolueth, that a man must not refuse to receive the Sa-  
crament kneeling, when he cannot haue it otherwise. I con-  
clude therfore, that this exception against our Ceremonies,  
that they are *Significant*, is the child of that vnhappy civill  
warre, with which the Churches of *England* and *Scotland*,  
haue beene, and are vexed.

*Com. in Luke 22.14.*

## C A P. 12.

## The second Argument answered.

From the scope of the second Commandement, and the  
publike Declaration of the Church, touching our Cere-  
monies aforesaid, this Argument may be framed :

Arg. 2. All Ceremonies devised by Man; or added to those  
which God hath prescribed, which are enjoyned or used as meanes  
of minding vs of God, or helping vs in any part of his worship, or  
carrying vs unto him therein, are against the scope of the second  
Commandement.

But the Croſſe and other our Ceremonies are devised by men,  
or added and applyed by men, to those Acts of Worship which God  
hath prescribed, as meanes to carry our thoughts unto God, and  
the duties which wee tender to him, as the Declaration aforesaid  
sheweth.

Therefore these our Ceremonies as wee intend and vſe them,  
are against the scope of the second Commandement.

Answe. Before Answer to this Argument, some Phrases  
must be explained.

1. Added to those which God hath prescribed, is a doubt-  
full speech. For it may ſignifie, addition of them as actes of  
worship euē as the other, and made parts of it, and not one-  
ly adiuncts to it. And in that meaning the Major Proposition  
is true, but the Assumption of our Ceremonies is false.

2. Againe, to bee meanes of carrying vs vp to God, or min-  
ding vs of God and our duties, &c. are ambiguous phrases,  
and may bee vnderſtood two wayes. 1. So as these meanes  
are vſed and vnderſtood as efficacie and operating meanes;  
which worke by ſome vertue ſuppoſed to bee in them, as  
the.

the Papists fancie of their hallowed trinkets; or else, as meanes onely occasionall, and obiectum à quo, objectively, whiche worketh at all nothing vpon vs, but presents vnto the sensis an occasion whereby the mind worketh vpon it selfe: as was the case of *Joshuah* his stone, set vnder an Oake in the Court of the Tabernacle. In the former Notion, the *Maior* is true, but the *Minor* false of our Ceremonies. In the latter sense the *Minor* is most true of our Ceremonies, but the *Maior* which saith, that the vse of such meanes for an helpe to vs, is against the scope of the second Commandement, is apparantly false.

For so farre is that commandement from bending agaist the devising and applying of such helps, as helps to vs in the worship of God, that it doth rather require some such. For, as M<sup>r</sup>. *Cariwright* saith, God in forbidding vs to bow downe to an Image or similitude set vp by mans will, doth on the contrary require, that we bow our Ielues in worship of him, and vse such gestures as agree to the worship in hand. Of which, seeing God himselfe hath not given any particular prescription, he hath left the devising or application thereof (vnder generall rules aforesaid) vnto men. And that such a thing is lawfull and vsefull, God (who vtterly forbiddeth any resemblance of himselfe to be made by man) hath witnessed by his owne Institution of *Tephylacteries* and *Fringes*, as monitory remembrances vnto man.

Indeed, if God in that second Commandement had simply forbidden all Images and Pictures to be made, as the *Turkes* understand that Law, then it would haue followed by Analogie, that men might not devise or vse any significant Ceremony at all. But when it is so, that he hath left free vnto man the picturing, engraving or expression of any visible creature, or history of things done, euen by God himselfe, so farre as it can bee well shadowed out by such workmanship, to teach and to mind vs of things profitable, as M. *Calvin*. *Instit. 1. 11. 12.* sheweth, and all our Divines accord; It will bee impossible to bring our significant Ceremonies, intended not as an immediete meanes of worship vnto God, but immedietly for an helpe and monitor to our selues,

In his Case  
chisme on the  
2. Command-  
ment.

*Exod. 12. 16.*

*Num. 15. 38*

*Deut. 12. 12.*

selues, vnder the lash of that second Commandement.

For 1. the object is altered. 2. The immediate vse (when mans edification, and not the worshipping of God immediatly is sought thereby) is cleane altered from such vse of the forbidden Images, as that Commandement forecloseth.

All our Divines (I thinke) are of one mind in this, that Ceremonies ought to be *Exercitio pietatis*, exercises of pietie, which may serue to vs as expressions and incitements to dutie, as *Calvin* saith, *which may edifie unto the worship of God*, as *Pareus* speakes. Yea, euen those which simply concerne *Order* and *Decencie*, ought to bee to *Edification*, as Dr. *Ames* saith, and those of *Decorum*, such as may shew and breed in vs a *Veneration* of Gods ordinances. So as significant Ceremonies can not for such an intention of Edifying men, bee blamed more then other Rites; vnlesse it bee for speaking as it were to the same end, which others doe, onely more plainly: as touching which I referre to the last Chapter, and what I haue forlaid about the second Commandement.

*Par. Com. in  
Rom. 14.*

### C A P. XIII.

#### The third Argument answered.

**VV**Hatsocuer Worship of God is not commanded, is not accepted of God. But Signing with the Crosse and kneeling are Worships of God not commanded. Ergo Crossing and kneeling at the Sacrament are Worships not accepted.

Argument. 3.

*Answ.* I referre to the fourth Chapter for the Notions of worship, and then Answer thus, that if you vnderstand worship which is properly so & ex s: of and in it selfe so reputed, the Major is true, but the Minor false of these our Ceremonies: If you understand worship Improperly, and per alius, in reference to some other thing, the Minor is true of our Ceremonies, but then the Major is untrue.

For, as necessary and proper worship is commanded, so there is a *Circumstantiall* (as Master Cartwright calls it) or *Reductive* worship, which is (as touching the particular) onely allowed. Now, though God doth more accept of the

commanded worship, yet hee accepteth also that which hee alloweth.

All prescript formes of prayers to God, if they be sound, are (as touching that externall forme) allowed worship only, but as touching their substance and internall forme, they are prescribed; and in that respect, otherwise acceptable then onely for the outward forme which is not worship *in se & proper se*, in it selfe and for it selfe as the other.

The vse of indifferent things saith *Parac.*, doth please God, but *non tanquam cultus, scil. in se*: but not as worship, to wit, in and of it selfe.

But to prove our Ceremonies to be Worship (suppose *in se & ex se*, in and of themselves) at least in our opinion and vse of them, you object to this effect.

Object. 4. *Dedication is Worship.* Ergo, the Crosse in our vse of it.

*Answ.* I deny the Consequence, which if you will prove from the thirtieth Canon, your Argument must bee thus formed.

By whosoever meanes a thing is dedicated to the service of God or Christ, by that meanes God is worshipped properly, and that meanes is made a proper worship of God in se, in it self. But by the signe of the Crosse the baptized Infante is dedicated to the service of him, that dyed for him, as the thirtieth Canon saith. Ergo, By that vse of the Crosse God is properly worshipped, and the signing with the Crosse is made of us, a meanes of proper Worship to God. To this Argument thus framed I further answer, that the Major is not sound. For as *Chamier* saith of vowes to God, that every vow to God is *Formally* worship, but not so *Materially* in the matter voluntarily vowed: So I say, dedication of any thing unto God, is worship *Formally*, but not always the matter dedicated *Ex se*, of it selfe, & much lesse the outward manner & Solemnity of dedicating.

I deny not but there may bee and is something done in *Dedication* of a thing to God, which *ratione precepti in se*, in respect of Precept and in it selfe is worship *Essentiall*: But there bee annexed thereto, other things, which pertaine not *Essentially* to that *Dedication*, but onely to the outward solemn-

leminity. And though those Proper aliud, with reference to some other thing may be called worship, yet are they no proper worship, or meanes of it in themselves.

In the Dedication of the Temple there were Ingredients of both sorts. The sacrifices, prayers, and prayses of God with joy, were Essentiall meanes of the Dedication and worship; but *Solomon kneeling on a brazen Scaffold before the Altar, and stretching his hands towards heauen in prayer*; the *set number of his Peace-offerings, the lengthning of the Solemnity vnto seuen dayes and 7. dayes, were meanes of the Dedication, not ad esse, to the being, but ad ornatum, to the ornament, partes of the solemnity and manner of worship, not worship ex se, but per aliud, in reference onely to some thing else, as they serued to expresse and further their holy rejoicing and thankfulness.*

The like may be seene in *Nehemias Dedicacion of the holy City*, which was dedicated with prayses to God, offerings and prayers *Reall*, but by a *Perambulation* about the wals and other solemnities there mentioned, *Complementall* & in Ceremony. The former reallities were Essentiall meanes of the Dedication, the other only Accessory Ceremonies adjoyned to the reall things, and no meanes of worship in themselves, but *per aliud*, by way of reference and reduction.

The Iewes did *Dedicate* their owne houses with prayers, hymnes, feastings and other Solemnities, saith Mr. Ainsworth, on *Dent. 20.5.*

If it seeme hard, That the *Dedication* is by the *Canon* referred to that vse of the *Crosse*. I answer, that the *Canon* doth not referre the *Dedication* to the *Crosse* *simply*, as though that were the sole or principall meanes; but onely, to that as a *Ceremony*. For thus goe the words, *Esteeming it a lawfull Ceremony and honourable badge whereby the Infant is dedicated, &c.* And if I should say that *Nehemiah dedicated the walls and City of Jerusalem*, by going about the walls thereof in two diuided companies, you could not gainsay me, nor would mistake the matter, For it is vsuall to ascribe a thing done, not alone to the principall Agent, but to any Instrument,

<sup>1</sup> Kings 8. and

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 6. —

Neh. 12.27.  
&c.

ment, yea sometimes to occasions which worke not, or to ad-  
mitts as M<sup>r</sup>. Cartwright well obserueth in his Answer to the  
Romists vpon thole words of 2. Cor. 4. 8.7. where it is said  
that our light affliction worketh for vs a far more exceeding and  
eternall weight of glory; [Worketh] yea and it is an vniual kind  
of speech to say, a thing is done by such a means as worketh  
not at all to the doing, but only declarerh what is done, or to  
be done. Thus <sup>a</sup> Joseph is said to haue hanged Pharaohs Butler;  
The Priest to haue made <sup>b</sup> cleane the Lepor, the <sup>c</sup> Sacrifices to  
make Assonement, the Ministers of the Gospele to <sup>d</sup> remise sins,  
<sup>e</sup> Jeremy to plant and plucke vp kingdomes, and to make them  
drinke of the Lords Cup of affliction. And thus wee say in Ma-  
riages, With this ring I thee wedd, which is after expounded  
that they haue declared their consent of Maringe, by gining and  
taking of a Ring. Nor could the Makers of that Canon other-  
wise understand themselves in those words, vnlesse they  
would thereby crosse all that they haue said before in the  
body of that Canon, in which they deny to the Crosse any  
Operatiue vertue, and professe that the Sacrament is not bet-  
ter with it, or worse without it. That the child is fully baptis-  
zed before that bee vsed, and incorporated by the vertue of  
Baptisme into the mysticall body of Christ, that they vse it  
only as the Fathers in their best vse, as a Ceremony and Badge.  
All which must bee ouerthrowne, if Dedication bee other-  
wise ascribed to the Crosse, then as vnto a Ceremony, which  
signifieth the vse of the Dedication it selfe (which is Really  
made by Baptisme) which is, to professe the faith of Christ  
crucified, &c. And that they so meant, and no otherwise,  
my poore selfe, and others who haue stumbled at the  
Phrase, might have assured our selues out of the body and  
words of the Canon, and the reference of their meaning to  
the Booke of Common-prayer, which expressly sheweth that  
this Ceremony is vsed only in token, &c. And in sooth (had  
not the Popish abuse and Superstitions about the Crosse,  
made vs iealous of all vse of it) who would not have thought  
this a decent Ceremony at the administration of Baptisme, to  
reminde all the congregation of their Christian profession, and  
warfare to which the Sacrament it selfe doth oblige them?

Where-

Wherefore if you were to subscribe to the letter of the Canon, as you are not, nor any man else, you need not feare to take that interpretation of Ceremoniall & only declarative Dedication. For without violence to the Canon or mistake of it, it is not possible to understand it otherwise. And therefore I say, that as I would not let my Curate vse it, if I held it unlawfull, so I will not forbear the vse of it my selfe, now that in my conscience I thinke the intended vse thereof to bee lawfull.

C A P. 14.

An Obiection vse'd to strengthen the former Argument answered.

Object. **T**here is no man that doubteth whether Kneeling bee worship or no. Ergo, At least that Ceremony of Kneeling when we receive the Communion, is not a matter of meere Order, but of Worship.

Ans'w. 1. It hath been shewed before, cap. 10. 1. that the gesture of Kneeling is neither worship, nor signe of it, but when so meant. A Carpenter kneels to drive a naile; doth any man thinke this to be worship? 2. That it is from common vse, and by construction a signe of respect or reverence as well in Civill as Sacred vses. 3. That it is not in any action of Gods solemne service, either unlawfull, as prohibited of God; or necessary, as commanded of him: though in some Actions, more suitable to the kind of Service, and more commodious to vs. 4. Lastly, that it never was fastened by divine Ordinance to any one kinde of religious action, or other. Wherefore the Question, Whether God hath given man any power to mixe Actions of his worship, more then to devise new worships of God, may very well be spared. For it supposeth Kneeling to be a worship by it selfe, or at least ingrafted by the hand of God, into some one action of his service, which is not so.

2. Wee yeeld Kneeling in the act of receiving the ho'y Commuacion, to bee in our intention, *largo sensu*, in a large sense, a worship of God; that is, *propter aliud*, in reference

to some other thing, not in, or ex se, in or of it selfe, but onely as all Circumstances obserued as matters of Order and Decencie, and Edification, for the honouring of God in his services, are worship, and not otherwise. The publike Declaration of the Church is that which most assurc vs of the intended vse, which because it is by some negligence left out of the later printed Booke of Common Prayer, I will heere set downe, that I may be sure you shall know it. There, after a Preamble it is said in these words :

The 5. Rubrick  
set at the end  
of the Commu-  
nion. It is ex-  
tant in all  
Books printed  
(as wel in ota-  
vo, as in fol )  
in 5. &c 6. Edw  
6 reestablished  
1. Eliz; and  
still in force.

Whereas it is ordained in the Booke of Common Prayer,  
in the administration of the Lords Supper, that the Commun-  
icants kneeling, should receive the holy Communion, which  
thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and  
gratefull acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, giuen vn-  
to the worthy Receiuer, and to avoyd the prophanation and  
disorder, which about the holy Communion might otherwise  
ensue, lest yet the same kneeling might bee thought, or taken  
otherwise, we doe declare, that it is not meant thereby, that  
any Adoration is done, or ought to bee done, either vnto the  
Sacramentall Bread and Wine, there bodily received; or vnto  
any reall and essentiall presence there being of Christs na-  
turall flesh and blood. For as concerning the Sacramentall  
Bread and Wine, they remaine still in their very naturall  
substances, and therefore may not bee adored, for that were  
Idolatry to bee abhorred of all faithfull Christians: and as  
concerning the naturall body and blood of our Saviour  
Christ, they are in heaven, and not here, for it is against the  
trust of Christs naturall Body, to bee in moe places then  
one, at one time.

1 Eliz.

3. To which I adde, that to take away all appearance of  
tendering any Adoration to the onward signes, then brought  
to the Communicants, the Church thought good after-  
wards \* to haue that short Prayer, *The Body of our Lord, &c.*  
then to bee made for each Communicant before he receive,  
(which in King Edwards Booke was not appointed) to the  
end

end that the Kneeling might not so much as seeme to be vndertaken vpon the sight and respect of the Sacramentall signes, and in reference to them. Thus carefull haue our Fathers bin to shew vs their minds, and to take away all appearance of evill, and ground of suspicion.

4. And it is worth the marking, that this gesture is at that time onely appoynted as a *signification* of our *bumble and gratefull acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ*, which (if it be not by our owne fault) we then receiuie; and not at any other time, when it might be supposed to bee intended to the Sacramentall signes, or to Christ, in and by them.

For as that learned Author of the Treatise called *Dialecticon Eucharistie*, printed at Geneva, and set out with the second Tome of Beza his Works, in his life time, saith, *The Bread is to vs the Body of Christ when we adore and receive it*, not as they doe in Poperie at the *Elevation*, when they *only looke on*, or *Circumgestation*, when it is carried in the streets, and they that *Adore*, receive nothing. And for this cause Mr. Calvin in answering that objection of the Papists, *inf. 4. 17. 37.* *that they adore Christ in the Sacrament*, saith, *Sicut Cena, &c.* If this were done in the Supper, I would say, *Eamus deum Adorationem esse legitimam, qua non in signo residet, sed ad Christum in celo sedentem referuntur*, that were yet a lawfull adoration, which resteth not in the outward signe, but is referred to Christ himselfe sitting in heauen. And hee giveth after, this reason, that they haue no promise of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, not as *signatum in signo*, as the thing signified in the signe, when it is consecrated to bee honoured and carried about as a pompous spectacle, and invocated; but when it is received. For our Lord that said, *This is my body*, sayd, *Take, eat, this is my body*. The Sacraments consist in their *use*, and are not Sacraments out of their *use*. The water in the *Font* is no Sacrament of Baptisme, but in the *use* of it.

5. Our Church therefore by appoynting this gesture at that time when we receive bodily the outward things, spirituallly the inward grace annexed (not by corporeall presence, but by instituted Relation) to the same; hath not referred this Ceremony to the outward things received of the Ministers

nisters hands, nor nor simply to the benefits received of, by, and with Christ, as a signe of our partaking them, but onely to our humble and gratafull acknowledgement of those benefits received from Christ, as the Declaration theweth. So that vnlesse humble and gratafull acknowledgement of those benefits agree not to that very hinc of time, when, by vertue of Gods Ordinance, we receiuē them, the signification thereof by the gesture, cannot bee unlawfull or uncomely, though it bee not simply necessary, but a matter of Order, not of proper worship in it selfe.

6. They therefore which spend their wits and time to proouē, either that wee ought not to giue Adoration to any sanctified creature; or, by adoring it, to transferre our adoration to God or Christ; or to perswade men that this gesture is vsed of vs, at least for Veneration of the conlecrated creatures, haue (in my opinion) too much time to spare, and not either Judgment or Charitie enough. For it is not done in relation to the Signes, or simply to the things signified, but only as an expression of our humble and gratafull acknowledgement of what we receive, and is to the honouiring of God and Christ by Consequent and redēction onely belonging, and that but as an outward and free Rite or formalitie.

7. But if in the Supper it selfe wee had respect vnto the sanctified creatures, as the ordinances of our Lord; and, by bowing our selues, not to them, but vpon occasion of them then brought to vs to bee received, not restyngh the honour or adoration in the elements themselves, though sanctified, but onely referring it to God and Christ the Son of God, not as carnally present in them, but sitting in heaven, and by his Spirit wonderfullly communicating his body and blood to vs; you see wee shoulde haue had M. Calvins approbation, as well as the ancient Fathers, S. Augustino and others which I could name, and not heerein deserue to bee matched with such of the learned Papists, as would haue no Adoration to determine in the Images themselves, but to be referred vnto, and rest vpon the Prototype, or first Sampler.

8. For the Lords *Sacraments* and *Word* are, (as Calvin faith) the lively images of God, and of his owne making, not ours.

ours. And therefore we may lawfully, and must haue such a respect vnto them, as we may not haue to any thing deviled by man; and wee may by them, (as *objecuum à quo*, by an object from whence, and *medium per quod*, a meanes by which) tender our adoration to God, which by an Image of our own heads made, we can not doe, without either breach of the 1 Commandement, if the adoration determine in the image, or prototype thereof being a meere creature; or breach of the 2 Commandment, though the adoration were referred only to God. For he hath said, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe, &c.* but neuer meant to restraine himselfe from such representation of himselfe, as he should like to give; or, vs from worshipping him & serving him in the vse of them. See Cap. 9.

And hence it is, that the people of God, before and after the Law, haue taken notice of Gods presence or gracie manifested by message, as Exod. 4 or signes ordinary or extraordinary given them of God, and haue with free consciences thereupon kneeled or bowed downe themselues to God vpon, at, or before those representations of Gods speciall presence or grace. Wherein if any man shall match them with Durand, Occam and others that worship Images, made at the will of men onely in relation to that which is worshipped, he shall be injurious to the Saints, and giue incouragement to that Popish conceit, without reason.

The Author of *Altare Damasc.* yeeldeth that the Iewes, at, or before the Arke, which was Gods instituted signe of his presence, or Temple in respect of the Arke, and so before the burning bush, Ex. 3, or armed man Iosb. 5, or cloud, Ex. 33. 9. or other signe given of God as a signe of his speciall presence, might lawfully vpon sight or respect of such a signe, Adore God. But saith he, the Sacraments are not signes of Gods speciall presence but gracie: and before, or respectiuely to such signes of grace *Adoration* is not lawfull, though onely referred to God.

But this man opposeth without reason, presence and grace, which both did often coincidere, fall both into one, as in the Arke, and cloud, and armed man, which were so signes of his presence, as they also were signes of his fauour and grace.

That a ~~armed~~ man in Joshua, professeth to come as a Captainne of the Lords hoste. Paul saith, our Fathers were baptiz'd under the clouds. The Arke is called the Arke of the Covenants; therefore Presence and Grace in these signes, are not opposite but conjunct.

2. Hee erreth when hee supposeth the Iewes to haue vsed this Adoration only at, or before the signe of speciall presence, and not of Grace. For they did it to God vpon occasion of his signes of fauour, as well as those of his speciall presence. For when the fire came downe from heauen, to burne, and as it were to shew Gods acceptance of their sacrifices (which was not simply a signall of his Presence, but of his speciall fauour) the people fell downe and worshipped God as well as at his foot stoole the Arke, or Cloud, Levit. 9. 24. and 2. Chron. 7. 3.

Ezra 9.5 and  
10.1. with 5.  
27. and 3.16.

Chemnit. in  
exam. part. 2.  
pag 91. edit.  
1578.

3. Hee mistaketh in saying they bowed and adored God at, or before the Tabernacle or Temple, in respect of the Arke only (so hee meaneth) which was therein. Ezra kneeled and cast downe himselfe before the very place of the Temple, as the house God, though there was neither Arke any more after the captiuitie, nor Temple then standing, but only the place which God had chosen for his name to dwell in, and a foundation of the Lords house.

It is much more found which Chemnitius obserueth that the people of God, vpon any occasion representing Gods speciall Presence or fauour to them, whether it were only by a Gracious message (as in Ex. 4. and 12.) or Action (as in Gen. 24. 26. 48.) or signe thereof giuen from God, they Adored and cast downe themselues, of which wee haue spoken much already, Cap. 10.

4. But if it were lawfull to Adore God onely at or before his owne Signall of his speciall Presence, the Arke, why not at the Sacrement, referring all the Adoration to God in Christ? For was the Arke any better signe of Gods presence, then the Bread and Wine are of the body and blood of Christ, whose names hee himselfe hath honoured them withall, as the Arke was honoured with the title of Iehovah, i.e. for the representation and Sacramentall Relation sake?

Doth

Doth any man diuide Christ himselfe from the Graces of Christ? verely wee in the Sacrament haue no hope of partaking the Grace of Christ, but by partaking himselfe his very body and blood, though not carnally or bodily, yet really and in truth; not in at our mouthes, but into our soules as spirituall food.

The conclusion of all, is, that if our Church intended that wee, in receiving the Communion, should looke vpon the Bread and Wine not simply as creatures, but as Sacraments of our Lords institution, and so beholding them, *Non quâ sunt sed quâ significant*, not as they are in their owne nature, but as what they there signify should tender a knee-Worship or Adoration, not at all to them, but only to God or Christ his sonne, by occasion of them, we should therein doe no more then the ancient godly Fathers did before Poperie, as that learned tract *Dialecticon Eucharistie* sheweth; I am sure no more then the godly Iewes did, as hath beeene shewed. And yet euен this Ceremony, so vsed, should bee no proper worship of God, or worship of and by it selfe, because it is not then and so commanded of the Lord; but only *Improper and Reductive worship,* and though not commanded, yet allowed of Gods word: And therefore but a matter of meere Order in the sense aforesaid.

5. But I haue already giuen in our Churches (publicke) Declaration, by which appeareth, that shee goeth not so far; but vnderstandeth this gesture to bee only for Signification of our humble and gratafull acknowledgement of those benefits bestowed of Christ in this his Ordinance vpon (not all men, but) the worthy Receivers. And therefore they which condemne this Church of a *Will-worship*, yea of flat *Idolatry* for this; and teach the poore people to forbear the Communion, rather then to receive it kneeling, haue more to answer for to God and his Church, then perhaps they thinke of.

6. For while they piouslly intending to sayle from (as I may say) the *North-pole* of the Popish *Idolatry*, not heeding the *Aequator*, haue sayled, though not home to the *South-Pole*, yet too neare it, into another extreame of *Superstition* and *Disworship* of God. *Disworship*, in turning their backes

upon the Lords table, for a gesture not forbidden of God: and *Superstition* in placing such a necessity in sitting or standing, which are neither of them commanded of the Lord (as is confessed) that they thinke themselves highly to honour and please God in the choyce of those gestures, or else not to communicate. This is to worship God after the traditions of men; Or else the Iewes were not guilty of it, by forbearing out of conscience, and for feare of pollution, to eate their meate with *vunashen hands*. Only this is so much the worse, as the spirituall food which they dare not touch nor taste, vniuersall they may take it *sitting* or *standing*, is better then the bodily from which the Iewes abstained. The Lord who hath given many of them godly desires, vouchsafe in mercy to cleare their judgements, and not to lay this errore to their charge.

## C. A. P. 15.

## The first part of the fourth Argument:

Answered.

Arg. 4. **T**he Law, (i. e. the 2. Commandement) forbiddeth two things: 1. The devising any new wayes of worship. 2. The vsing of prescribed worship otherwise then they are directed. But some of our Ceremonies are devised new wayes of worship, or usage of the prescribed worships otherwise then they are directed. Ergo, the Law forbiddeth them.

*Answ.* What things the Law of the second Commandement doth forbid, I haue said, and graunt the same, or, with it, the third Commandement to forbid these two things you mention. But I will consider these two apart, and so make two Arguments of one, for perspicuities sake.

The Law forbiddeth the devising of new wayes of worship. But our Ceremonies are devised new wayes of worship, Ergo.

I suppose you meane, that as the Devising is forbidden, so the things devised, &c. otherwise wee shall be vtouched, who onely use these Ceremonies, but devised none of them. And then I say, that the termes are ambiguous, and must bee made cleare before the Answer bee given to the Argument.

I. Wer-

I. Worship of God (as hath beeene proved) is Proper or Improper, Ex se, or per accidens, of it selfe, or by accident, & per aliud, by reference to some other thing; As for example, saith Chamer. *In Ieremie nulla pietas est, nisi quatenus utile Cham. Tom. 4. interdum restanda interna penitentie & preparacioni ad precos, lib. 43. cap 8.*

In fasting there is no worship, but as it is viesfull sometimes for testification of inward humilation and for preparation to prayer. So wayes, (i.e. meanes) of worship, are also either meanes by the vse whereof *Immediacy* of themselues, Service is done or supposed to bee done to God; or meanes *more remore*, and not in themselves or by themselves any service, or reputed any service of God, but by accident, and per aliud, in reference to some what else, as in Chamer's instance, *Fasting*. By new wayes, you meane, not lately taken up, but such as haue not their Prescriptio[n] in the Word. For all substantiall or proper worship, is now worship to God, which himselfe hath not Commanded. And then I answer, That of Proper and Immediate worship Ex se, of it selfe, or so esteemed, the Major is true, but the Minor falfe of our Ceremonies, which being acknowledged things of indifferent nature, and such as the Church may at pleasure alter, cannot bee understood to bee made, in that sense, any new worship, or wayes of worship. But if yeu speake of worship in a larger meaning of the word; and, by wayes, understand any meanes tending (at the long runne) to the honouring of God, and intended onely as *Adiuncts* to the proper worship of God, and for an helpe to vs in the same; Then is the Minor true of our Ceremonies, viz. that they are, in such a notion, new devised wayes of worship. But the Major, which saith, that all devised wayes of worship are eu[n]c in that sense forbidden, is manifestly false. For example, This or that prescript forme of prayer, is a new devised way of worship, as touching the Set-forme, yet not forbidden. The Fasts of the fourth, See Zach. 8. 19. fift, seventh & tenth moneths, reminding the very moneths and speciall dayes of their calamities, that they might with more life and feeling humble themselves before God, in the emptiuit, were such new devised waye of worship to God, in our sense, and not commanded of God, Zach. 7. 4. yet not

*and Iunius his  
Annot.*

forbidden or condemned, as Master Cartwright confesseth. And the like is to bee laid of all unprescribed circumstances (considered in their particulars) which belong to Order, Decency and Edification, that they are remote and accidentall wayes of worship, and devised, or, (which is all one) so applied and determined by the will of man; and yet, neither commanded nor forbidden, but only allowed in themselves.

*Medul. Theol. part. 2. cap 14. Thes. 24.* For to say, as Doctor Ames, *Principiuntur in genere sub lege Ordinis Decori & Edificationis*, they are commanded in generall vnder the law of order, comeliness and edification, is not reasonable. For if these particulars bee commanded which fall vnder the generall heads, then must the obseruacion of the particulars bee necessary, because commanded, and not things left to choise. Neither is it sound which hee saith,

*Habenda tamen sunt tanquam ex voluntate Dei praecepta*, they are to bee reputed as commanded out of the will of God. Or (as after) that, if they bee to all points well ordered, or that, *Constitutio ista habenda sit quasi simpliciter Divina*, that constitution is to be taken as simply diuine; for the constitution is onely of the particulars, and is limited to things left of God. Indifferent in themselves, and therefore cannot bee said to be simply diuine, but, after a sort; No not when the things are in kind such as necessarily follow of those things which God hath exprely commanded, which is Doctor Ames his second reason. For example, the very particular place where, and hower when, we must meet vnto the publicke worship of God, are not in themselves particularly commanded in genere suo, vnder their generall, and the obseruance, euen of them, must bee with a conscience free from tye to the place or time, in regard of themselves; otherwise, there is a superstitious use of them. So that that which in them may be called Diuine and a commanded Circumstance of worship, is, a place, and a time as commodious as wee can; but not, this place or this hour.

And if all conueniences require this very place, and this very hour, yet is not the place required propter se, for it selfe, but propter aliud for some other thing: It is therefore better to say, That the particulars devised or determined by men, to be obserued as Ceremonies or outward Rites in the wor-

worship of God, are in all particulars, when they most agree to the generall Rules of the word, only *Allome*. And yet, if by the neglect and contempt of such externall Rites, *Violatur aliquo modo sanctitas cultus religiosi*, the purity of religious worship bee violated (as Doctor Ames saith, and saith *Ibid. Thes 23.* well) then the Observuation of them must *aliquo modo* some way bee some worship of God, however (as hee also saith) *In ipsis non propriè consistit cultus religiosus*, religious worship consisteth not properly in them, not properly faith he; but yet, *in a sort*, say I.

And indeed if wee will admit no more into the worship of God then is commanded, as the Anabaptists require, wee shall, in baptizing, onely *lay on Water in the name of the Father, of the Sonne and o[ne] the Holy Ghost*, and not vse (lawfully) any of those set prayers, before or after, nor rehearste the summe of the Christian faith, nor haue any speciall witnesses, nor then give the name as it were to shew that wee are as it were without a name, or being *Lame* till wee bee entred into professed Couenant with God; nor, any Scripture then read to shew the lawfulnessse of baptizing Infants, no Interrogatories to expresse the conditions of our Covenanter with god; and not onely, no signe of the *Crosse* as a *monitorie Ceremony* to the congregation, forasmuch as God hath not commanded any of these *thus* to bee done, in the vse of that Sacrament.

The like may bee said of all the Readings, Prefaces, Exhortations and Prayers (excepting that only which by repeating the institution, and praying for the blessing of God on vs in that vse of them) are prescribed in our *Leitorgy*, euuen till wee come to the *breaking* of the *Bread* and to *distrination* of it and the *Cup*. Namely, that these, so farre as by the will of man they are devised, and determined thus to be done, They are not things in their particular thus commanded of God, and therefore *Ex se*, of themselves, are not proper worship of God, respectiuely to that *veri forme, Order, and time* of vsing them; But either as they are in their owne Generall, as the prayers; or, referred to *Order, Comelinesse and Edification*, which God hath

commanded to bee aimed at, and obserued in all actions of his worship, i. e. propter *blind*, for some other thing. So then in themselves only allowed, and Improperly worship of God.

And if in such things thus devised and determined by men, which are not in themselves necessary, but onely lawfull, there may be no respect at all of honouring God in the vse of them, though not simply for themselves; How hath the Apostle told vs that *one man eateth*; or, *obserueth the day to the Lord*, and another *eateth not*; or, *obserueth not the day*; and, this man *eateth not*; and, *obserueth not the day, even unto the Lord*? Or, what ground of faith could men haue in doing things so contrary, as *eating* and *not eating*; vniuersall it were, that God had allowed either, but commanded neither the one nor the other? For the *Command* of one must haue bin the *Prohibition* of the contrary. But in *rebus medijs*, in things indifferent, saith *Parens*, not onely diners, but even *contrary* things please God: but *non tanquam cultus*, not as a worship in themselves. For in such things, no contrariety, yea no variance from the parterne given in the Mount (as I may say) I meane Gods *Prescript*, is tollerable.

A man is bound, at such a time, to pay an hundred pounds in current English money. In this case if hee pay it all in gold, or siluer; or, in both, at the time, the bond is discharged, because it was onely for such a summe of current English money.

But if a man be bound to pay the same summe at the same time, in good gold, siluer or that valew will not discharge his bond, because it was not onely for the value in current money, but for the *species* or kind of money. In this case therefore, the *species*, *ex se* and *in se*, the very particular kind, in and of it selfe, is part of the payment, as well as the *value*. But in the other case the *Species* or particular kind simply considered *ex se*, of it selfe is nothing to the payment, saue onely in the *Generall*, as it is *current money*, and secondly as it amounteth to the *Summe*. So is our case. Where God himselfe hath for his seruice determined the *Circumstances*; as, vnder the Law, The *place of Sacrifice*, and *times* of their three

*Quo supra. in  
Rom. 14.*

solemne Feasts, or Apparell of the Priests, or ought else in particular; Those very Circumstances were part of the proper and principall worship, as well as the maine Actions, because of the Command of God. But where God hath commanded only the maine substance of a seruice to him, and not prescribed the particular maners, but onely giuen rules of direction, those particular circumstances are not any worship or seruice of God in themselues, nor may without Superstition be so esteemed, but only as they are parts of Order and Decency, and serue to the Edification of men, which God hath required in all the maine Actions of his prescribed seruice, i.e. the particulars are proper alind, in reference to some what else a worship of God, and in themselves onely allowed not commanded meanes thereof.

I maraile sometimes at some of our brethren, who, to prove that wee make our Ceremonies a very worship to God, tell vs that if the very same things were done to the very same end by Divine institution, they must needs bee worship; and then true worship, because required of God, and therefore ours must needs bee worship of God; and not being commanded, Will-worship. As if they had not yet learned, That the onely command of God doth make that to bee in it selfe, an Act of necessary and substantiall worship to him, which though to the same end, and in the same manner done voluntarily, nor was, nor is esteemed any part of the reall worship in it selfe, but onely per & proper alind, by and for some reference to some other thing. As for example. The building and vse of Altars here or there, before God had chosen out the standing place for his Altar (though to the same end, for which the Lords instituted altar served, i.e. for Sacrifice) was not worship in respect of the place, or kind of stone vsed, or height, length, or breadth; But onely as an allowed Instrument of the necessary worship, not sanctifying the offering, as did Gods sanctified Altar, but sanctified, in a sort, by the offring.

To conclude, All that either in truth is, or may be esteemed a proper and necessary part of Divine worship, and meane of honouring God, even in the thing so done, must

bee

bee so made by the will of God, or else is vaine and will-worship.

But such things as are not understood, or vsed, as in themselves necessary, immediate, and proper worship of God, but onely by accident, and proper aliud, in reference are worship, but after a sort in themselves, and haue no Precepte of God vpon themselues, in their particular, but onely an allowance or Generall warrant. And this is no otherwise a Will-worship, then was the worship of the freewill offerings, wherein the particular choise was left free to the men themselves. Onely, if a man will enbaunce the value of this Improper and reductiue worship, and haue it goe currant at a higher rate, then God euer allowed, euen for proper seruice in it selfe, hee shall then make of his improper worship, a proper will-worship to Gods dishonour, in as much as hee will needs returne it to God at another rate, then God himselfe set vpon it in his allowance. Which is as one shoulde offer to pay the Kings Subjects in siluer or gold pieces, rated aboue the value, which the King himselfe hath set on them. This is a non-payment, though the Species or particular kind, bee currant, because the value is not right. And when men thinke to honour God by such meanes, so esteemed, they dishonour him, not simply in the meanes, but because of the misprizing and abuse. And so much for this Argument now to the next.

## C A . P . X V I .

### The second part of the fourth Argument answered.

*Argum. 4.  
pars 2.*

**T**HE Law, secondly forbiddeth the prescribed worships of God, to bee vsed otherwise then they are directed. But, the Observance of our Ceremonies is an usage of Gods prescribed Worship otherwise then the same is directed. Ergo. Forbidden of the Law.

*Answ.* If by [otherwise] you meane (in any other outward manner;) and, by [directed] understand [commanded] the Major is false. For the circumstances concerning the

outward manner, (as touching their particular determination) are not commanded of God, but vnder the Generall rules of his Direction, left vnto the choyse of men, as is confessed in generall words by all men that oppose our Ceremonies, however they pare this graunt afterwards, of purpose to exclude our Ceremonies from all relcefe thereby.

But if by [otherwise] you meane so otherwise, as that, wee disoyne what God bath vnted, the outward worship from the Internall, i. e. the body from the soule ; or, that wee alter that which God hath Ordered, as in the bafte-Communion of the Papists, &c. Or that the manner and exterrnall fashion bee not framed to the generall rules of Gods direction, Order, Decency, and Edification ; Then the Maior is true, that such things are forbidden by the Law, i. e. either by the second or third Commandement. But then the Minor, touching our Ceremonies, must be denied to bee true, till it shall bee proued, which will not bee by this Argument, but must be, if at all, by some particular and iust exception against them.

C. A. P. 17.

The defence of the Answers given to this  
fourth Argument.

This Answer will not seeme to satisfie the Argument,  
till wee haue discouered and removed sundry petty en-  
gines, which haue been planted against it, and seeme to some  
men to batter it to the ground, and to make nothing of it,  
which I will, so farre as I can, set forth *Ab ovo*.

When the day of Mercy shined on the Church of God, and gaue men strength and spirit to withdraw themselues from that leprous Church of *Rome*, nothing was more ne-  
cessary, then to make the people know, that the vaine pompe  
and Stage-plays of human Rites which went then currant for an  
high seruice of God (while in the meane time his owne pre-  
scribed seruice, was either obscured and defaced, or annihi-  
lated and neglected) was no truse seruice of God. Hence, you  
shall find the Diuines of that time labouring mainly vpon  
this point, That nothing may bee esteemed or vsed as a wor-  
ship,

ship of God, such as hee would reward, and men might not omit without sinne, (which was and is the rate of all the Popish Ceremonies in their accounts, from the greatest to the least of them) saue onely what God himselfe hath in his word prescribed. In the meane time they denied not a liberty to the Church, for ordaining of things for *Order, Decency, and Edification*; and such, and so many, as the necessity of the Church should at any time require. But not for a *Worship*, vnderstanding worship as their aduersaries did, for such an act as in it selfe was pleasing to God, and so as he would bee offended if it were not so done to him.

Hercupon sundry well minded people began to thinke of all that in Popery was made part of the diuine worship, and vrged as necessary for conscience sake, to bee so obserued to the honour of God: And not considering warily, whether things were at all in themselves too blame, or only in respect of the *superstitious vse and opinion* of them, they concluded, that all was vnlawfull to bee vsed in any Act of religious seruice, which was not commanded (which, of seruice properly so to bee called, is true) and thereupon resolued, no *Temples, Bells, Fonts, Gessips, &c.* And because they found not a plaine command for an *Oath* in cases of Iudicature; no *swearing*: and, for the like reason, no *Baptizing of Infants*, No set formes of prayer, or Order of reading Scripture since it is not in the Bible; no *habits*, no *gestures*, but such as were necessary in common vse; nothing at all obserued which might haue any particular reference to anything *Divine or Ecclesiastical*, not so much as a *Cloake or Gowne* for a Minister as a *distinctive garment*, nor ought else which might bee called *Ecclesiastical*. And as men went with more or fewer sayles carried along with this conceite, so haue they fallen short or gone further in their misapplication of the true ground of Diuinity, which our great Divines had deliuered *ex hypothesi*, conditionally and in a strict sense of the termes [*Worship of God.*]

From hence, in the first *Admonition to the Parliament*, they quarrelled at the frame and forme of our Church-orders; and, set downe this rule, *Whatsoever is not commanded*

of

of God in his word may not bee received in the Church. This, when Master Cartwright vndertooke to defend against the late Arch-bisshop, Doctor Whigift, hee (as hee was a man of a great wit and parts) found how that speech might bee mainetainable, and yet some liberty left vnto the Church in constituting matters of Order; namely, that in as much as the things left vnto the Churches determination, were limited to certaine generall rules of the word which are *Commandments*, therefore the *particul rs* which according to these rules were appointed, might bee laid to bee commanded, (iust as wee heard out of Doctor Ames, *principiuntur in genere suo*, they are commanded vnder their generall) which was but a meere shift of his wit. For though those generall rules bee *Precepts*, yet the various *specialities* which fall vnder them are not thereby commanded (not those, specially) but onely allowed.

But when this Answer was found too short to smite downe our Ceremonies, for which, this was pleaded, that they were not *contrary* but *agreeable* to the statutes of Gods word; and, as such, intended, and to bee vsed; and that, if they would disproue any thing they must insist vpon that particular, and not thinke to condemne it by a generall Sentence, as Master Hooker told them: Then they sought out a new way, i. e. That things left to the Churches dispose, are only *Circumstances of time and place, and such things of Decorum as were as well received and practised for like ends in common use, as in Ecclesiasticall.* And by this rare devise (which I take to bee Master Jacobs) they haue made a shift to rescue *Churches, Bells, Fonts, a Communion-table and Cloath, and Cup, and if need bee, a Church yard to bury in, and some few other matters from the sentence of the Rigid Anabaptists.* But haue left all other things, which are (as they speake) *stated in, i. e. appropriated to any actions of Gods externall seruice, to bee executed as guilty of some treachery against god, in his worship.* Therefore (saith Master Jacob) God hath not left unto the Churches liberty or determination, so much as our Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies. Which (a better man then hee, and one that from my heart I both loue and honour) Doctor Ames hath

hath taken, as vpon trust from him or other such Author,  
 as his words before alleadged may witnesse in part ; and  
 some others of like alleadgement ; as namely, *Partis 2. disp.*  
*15. Sec. 25.* where hee boundeth and restraineth all that is  
 left of God vnto the choyle and disposition of men in this  
 manner, *Illa igitur quia pertinent ad ordinem & Decorum, non*  
*ita relinquuntur hominum arbitrio, ut possint quod ipsis liber sub*  
*illo nomine Ecclesias obtrudere: sed parsim determinantur genera-*  
*libus Dei preceptis, parsim natura ipsarum rerum, & parsim*  
*circumstantijs illi quia ex occasione sese offerunt;* These things  
 therefore which pertaine to order and decency are not so  
 left to the pleasure of men, that they may, vnder that name  
 and pretext, obtrude what they list vpon the Churches; but  
 are determined partly vnder Gods generall precepts, parti-  
 ly by the nature of the very things themselves, and partly by  
 those circumstances which occasionally offer themselves.  
 Of which sentence the former halfe is most true ; the later,  
 not so sound. For then nothing at all beyond *meere necessary* ;  
 as, a *time*, and *place*(which are his owne instances, *Thes. 24.*)  
 or such, as the very nature of the things necessarily vrgeth ;  
 or, casualties ; as for example, to meet in a *wood*, in time of  
 persecution ; or, when there is no helpe, to set the bread  
 and wine vpon the bare ground ; Nothing, I say, more then  
 these, are left vnto the Churches ordering ; nothing that  
 may, by any *signification*, helpe to remember vs ; Nothing  
 that may serue to breed reuerence towards Gods ordinan-  
 ces, and put some speciall outward markes of difference be-  
 twixt common or sacred, *Civill* or *Religious* affaires ; no-  
 thing of gestures, habits, memoratiue dayes of Christ's In-  
 carnation or Resurrection ; No prescript forme of prayers to  
 bee vsed otherwise then as a *Plat-forme*, as *Altare Damas-  
 eenum* ; vniess perhaps suting at the Communion in token of  
 Co heireship with Christ, because in *Civill use* it is a *table*  
 gesture, and *fashion of familiarity*.

I will alleadge some few of our great Divines, and see  
 whether they by *Rites* and *Ceremonies* left vnto the libertie  
 of the Church, meane nothing but the sage which our men  
 understand by *Circumstances of time and place, common as well*

in Civill, as Religious vse, though I grant not few to be such. And because they are wont to name time and place, putting thereto a blind [ &c. ] or [ et similia, ] we will see whether about Time and Place, the learned Divines, and they bee of one minde.

A speciall place destinatated, and in respect of the vse sancti- *Zanch. Tom. 4.*  
fied, and called Sacred, which vnlesse in case of extreme ne- *pag. 764.*  
cessitie, should not be imployed to any other then the desti-  
ned vses, *Zanchie alloweth and requireth as a thing comely.*  
Will *Altare Damascenum* ( crow you ) permit this to the  
Churches libertie?

An Altar of stone, or a Table of wood, *Zanchie and others pag. 485.*  
leauie to the Churches determination, as *in se medis*, indiffe-  
rent in themselues, though a Table bee fitter. Will our  
men say so?

That the Communion Table should not (but in case of ex- *Ibid.*  
treame necessitie) be put to common vte, *Zanchie requireth.*  
Is this their rule?

That Table and Vessels for the Communion, hee calleth *pag. 785.*  
holy Vessels, as dedicated to holy vse. Is this all one with Ci-  
vill vte?

That one lawfull End of building Temples, is Significancie, *Repl. to Bish.*  
to remind vs of our Communion with God, and his in hea- *Morton, part. 1.*  
uen, *Zanchie affirmeth.* Then taith the Replier, Away with  
all mysticall Churches. *cap. 3. sett. 32.*

As touching Times of worship, besides the *Lords dayes, Calvin. Inst. 4.*  
*Calvin* putteth that vnder the Churches hand and determi- *10. 31.*  
nation, as not determined in the Word; and on what *dayes* *sett. 29.*  
the Lords Supper should be administred.

And *Zanchie* saith of the Solemnities of *Easter, Pentecost, Quo<sup>o</sup> supra*  
the *Ascension* and *Nativitie* of our Lord, sanctified as of the *p. 676.*  
Ancients; or kept holy, it could not bee disliked. Nay, that  
*landabile est, & honestum argue vtile*, it is laudable, honest or  
seemely, and profitable, and proues it too. Will ours allow So in effect *Iu-*  
these Feasts in memoriall of the mercies on such dayes be- *nus cont. lib. 4.*  
stowed, as a *Circumstance of time*, necessary as well in *Civill pag. 183.*  
as Religious vses? Doe they not condemn the Feast of *Dedi-*  
cation, as rashly instituted by the *Maccabees*? And of their

owne heads tell vs, that the Feast of Purim was either only a merry meeting, of friends; as Mr. Jacob, and Altare Damasc. Or, that Mordecas was a Prophet; as the Replier, onely because they would not haue it thought that the Church may, by her authoritie, separate a whole day to the solemne worship of God, vnlesse for Fasting perhaps. Not that the Church can make an hallowing Holy-day as is the Lords day, the Sabbath; but, hallowed dayes for the vse to be observed with free Consciences.

But beside Time and Place, the Divines referre to the Churches determination, whether the Publike Prayers shall bee all said, or sung; as Zanchie; what Psalms on what dayes, Calvin. quo supra Sect. 31. What habit shall be worne in administering the Lords Supper, whether their common, or a peculiar garment, Woollen or linnen. And Zanch (for the signification) preferres the linnen, though in other respects hee saith; rectius rejicitur, it is better rejected of some Churches.

a Chem. exam. a Chemnitius alloweth some of the old significant Rites vsed  
part. 2. pag. 36. anciently in Baptisme, while only so vsed. Junius professeth  
that if we were agreed in Doctrine, and the superstition remoued, we should not disagree with the Papists for the Rite  
or Ceremonie of Exorcisme. The like he saith of the vse of

b Junius cont. b Croffe in sacris. But what doe I mention these or other particular persons, such as Bucer, Melanethon, against whom and Lavater, Zanchie, and some others, there is a pre-munire Caveat aded to the Replyers first part, That forsooth some of them wrote in the dawning of the day, others liued in England, as Martyr; Clemnitius was a Lutheran; Zanchie was of a timorous disposition; they were not well informed when they gave approbation to our Church Rites, and such other geare: by which all men may know, that the judgements of those graue Divines sute not with theirs in this matter. And furthermore, that they had rather sinke the reputation of all the Lords Worthies, then yeeld themselves to haue mistaken any thing. If any particular man be of waight with them, it is Mr. Calvin, who in truth deserveth the first honourable chaire of them all. When the Bishop Morton had produced a Testimonic of his, ex Inst. 41 10.

¶. 10. 30. as full and direct as could bee, to shew what hee  
judgeth to be left vnto the determination of the Church in  
matters of Discipline & Ceremonies not determined in the  
Word. The *Replyer*(not reciting the text of *Calvin*) calleth  
the *Bishop*, that there is nothing which without the equi-  
vocation of the word *Ceremonie* will serve his turne; *Cal-*  
*vin* meant nothing but necessary Circumstances of *Order*,  
as *time and place*, &c. but no *significant Ceremonies*. *Calvin*  
saith, God hath giuen certaine generall Rules, vnto which  
must bee squared whatsoever the necessitie of the Church  
shall require of *time and place*, &c. for, there is no necessitie  
of our *significant Ceremonies*. Wherein he maketh a pret-  
ty shift of escape vnder the shadow of that word *necessitie*.  
But in following the same matter, *Calvin* saith, what the *uti-*  
*litie* of the Church shal require, counting that necessary to  
the Church, which is either of it selfe, or by accident *neces-*  
*sary* for the Churches Peace and building vp, as he hath be-  
fore in that Chapter said, and doth after.

The necessitie of the Church required that old Decree  
of *Abstaining from blood and strangled*, which in it selfe was  
not necessary, nor (as M<sup>r</sup>. *Sprint* hath shewed) simply *consen-*  
*tient*. Which for our vse of the Ceremonies instituted, is ar-  
gument enough; vñless there bee no need of our Ministry  
in the Church, or of the Churches quiet, or of obedience to  
our Prince in things not evill in themselves. But, there is yet  
no necessary use of our *significant humane Ceremonies* in the  
**Church**. Simple necessitie there is none. But necessitie of  
*utilitie*, *Calvin* acknowledgeth, when of *Symbolicall Rites*; he  
professeth himselfe to thinke me such to bee a profitable  
helpe to the weaker sort, *Scpl. 28*. Which likewise in his  
Treatise of *The Right Way of Reforming the Church*, he doth  
also profess: Denying himselfe at all to striue against Cer-  
emonies, which are either for *Order*, or yet for *Decorum*, *Vel*  
*etiam symbola sunt & incitamenta eius quam Deo debemus re-*  
*verentia*, or such as are signes of, and incitements to that re-  
verence which wee owe vnto God. And in his 78 Epistle  
to the Lord Protector, *Ceremonias ad usum captiuorumq; populi*  
*esse accommodandas*, Ceremonies must bee accommodated to the

vise and capacitie of the people ; which must be vnderstood, in part, of some significant Ceremonies; else, why *ad caput populi*? must the peoples capacitie bee so much respected? Indeed *Calvin* requireth, that such significant Ceremonies be but few, and such as may not obscure Christ. But that hee alloweth some such to be instituted of the Church, even for the helpe of *signification*, is as cleare as the Sunne at Noone-day. And he that will marke how the *Replyer* laboureth to hide the light of his Testimonies, shall finde, that his *Repty* thereto borrowed much from his wit, without asking leaue of his Conscience. But why doe I detaine you in the Survey of particular men? The *Harmony of Confessions*, set out with the Notes of the *French* and *Dutch* Churches, will best shew how much the Churches of Christ haue judged to be left vnto the determination of men. And how short of that allowance all those men come, who will not permit her to constitute so much as one *merely Ecclesiastical Ceremony*, but to containe her in the constitution of such things, as all men of themselves are bound to obserue, euен without any *Constitution*, and which no power of man can forbide.

You aske me, *Where any such power is giuen to the Church?* I answeare out of *M<sup>r</sup>. Calvin*, and *D<sup>r</sup>. Ames* too; viz. where shee is enjoyned to doe all things of Gods prescribed worship according to *Order*, *Decencie*, and to *Edification*. For what doth *necessarily* serue vnto those rules, shee is rather commanded, then simply allowed to consider and take care of. And sure I am, that though *Order* strictly taken, belongeth but to *Ibi, quando*, to place and time, &c. yet the *determination* of that, belonging to each Church, requireth many things. Now, as *Order* and *Decencie* in the outward manner of handling all and the severall parts of Gods instituted service, is required of the Churches; so is it, that all bee done to *Edification*; which is not that *all*, that men lust to impose vnder the name of *Order*, *Decency*, and *Edification*, is *commanded* or *allowed* by that charge of the *Holy Ghost*; but that *all*, which shee is to *dispose* of, be such indeed, so farre as shee can judge. Whence will follow, that in Rites serving to *Order* or *Decencie*, there should bee what helpe wee can to *Edifica-*

*Edification by the significancie of those Rites.* For seeing the outward ordering should be such, as may most edifie, as Dr. Ames saith, how can it bee but luch a Rite as is *Comely* for the matter in hand, and agreeable to the vse and intent ther-of, shall be vnto men the more helpfull, if it carry some manifest signification in the forehead? For this reason Zanchius preferreth (and so doth M. Perkins) the ceremony of *Immersion vnder the water*, before that of *sprinkling*, or laying on the water, as holding more Analogy to that of *Paul*, Rom. 6. that we are *buried with Christ in Baptisme*.

And the same \* Zanch. speaking of the Ceremonies vsed in taking a solemne oath, laying the hand upon the Altar; or, as the Iewes, and we, upon the Booke of the Covenant, or lifting up the hand to heauen, saith, That none of these Ceremonies are to be disliked, because they all haue their, and those weighty significations. And, in sadness, when it is to vs to familiar a thing in all solemne actions, to haue something signified to vs by Ceremony; how can it bee blameable in a Ceremonie of the Church, that it is significant, I meane, simply *ex nomine*, in that very respect? For, if there be a surfeit made of them, or any operative vertue supposed to bee in them, or any necessarie or opinion of worshipping God by them *ox se*, as of and in themselves, such vsedoth pollute them, and all that so vse them.

In gestures, it will bee acknowledged readily, that they may be fitt to the leverall kinds of Gods prescribed Service, euен for signification, as M. Cartwright, and M. Fenner shew. But (saith *Aliare Damasc.*) wee must not bee tyed to them. In which, if hee meant, not tyed by the conscience, as if it were a sinne, euен in it selfe, not to vse them in the publike service of God, I am fully with him: But either I foulely mistake him, or else his meaning is, that what wee will doe freely of our selues, this way, is good; but if once the Magistrate or Church require it to bee done, then all is marred. Thinke of this, and thinke withall, whether the same men which refuse *kneeling* in receiving the Communion, (all or most of them) doe not also forbear to *kneele* when the Commandements are read, to euery whereof, a prayer for pardon,

and for grace to keepe that Law, is subjoyned. Yea, and when Publike profession of the Faith is made, to stand vp: which is a most comely gesture, and without all exception. And tell me, in Conscience, what can bee the reason of such refusall, but because it is so appoynted by the Law, and Authoritie both of State and Church? otherwise, they would like well enough then, to stand.

Ob. Burghersesse (say they) signifie Naturally, or as it were Naturally, but our exception is against such things as signifie on- ly by appoyntment of men, as the Ring in Marriage, Surplice and Crosse; and these we condemne.

I answer. 1. That they question our kneeling, though it signifie giving of honour never to naturally; not onely as misapplied, but as a significant ceremony. 2. For the Surplice, that it is but a distinctive garment, as the addition of Hoods, to be put on after mens Degrees, may shew. But, let it signifie the purenesse that ought to be in the Minister of God, in Gods fight and service. The Ring is mereley a civill signe of the Matrimoniall Contract, as is loyning of hands. The Crosse indeed would not signifie what it doth of it selfe, but by institution. But as I have shewed, the very bodily gestures doe not *vs themselves* signifie; but, by the Intencion and Cu-stomes of men, which is as by *second Nature*. And so doth putting off of the hat signifie a respect also; which, when they allow, though appoynted by men, at the Sacrament, the signification notwithstanding, this is but a made quarrell, that our Ceremonies signifie, not but by *Institution and long Cu-stome of men*. And I pray you, what difference vpon the matter, whether by *naturall light*, or *generall notice* of the meaning, the Ceremonie bee significant? And, why not? Forsooth, this is to give them part of the nature of Sacra-ments. Indeed, some in their heat call them *Sacraments*; as, Master Parker in his Treatise of the Crosse. But Doctor Ames checketh that over-shoot, and saith, they are but *Sacramentalia*, *Sacramentals*; not well vnderstanding, that Ceremonies were called *Sacraments*, scil. not from this, that they signified, for so did almost all Popish Rites, (witnesse Durandus) but because they were appertinent to some of their

their Sacraments, non ad esse, but ad ornatum, not to their being, but to their comely being.

Take away, saith Saint Augustine, the Element, and there is no Sacrement; and, take away the thing signified, saith Zanchie, and there is no Sacrement neither. Sacraments therefore, are not simple signes; but *Significantia, obsignantia & instrumentaliter exhibentia quod significat*, signes signifying, sealing and instrumentally exhibiting that which they signify. The symbolical Rites in Poperie, vised to effect some supernaturall grace, by their vs, were indeed presumptuous and sawcy counterfeits of divine Sacraments. But, that *meere signification* of a morall duty, should *more* then participate the proper nature of a Sacrement, I shall then beleue when I shall perceue the signe of the sunne in a shop-window, to partake the nature of the same; or of Baals Image, made to represent the lame. The nature of the Sacraments consisteth not simply, in that they doe *signifie*, which is common to all signes; but, in that they signifie the Covenant of grace by *divine institution*, and *seale* it to vs. Nor doe I beleue that Joshua pitched a Sacramentall signe in Shechem, though it was to reminde them of the Covenant of God, of which, Circumcision was the Sacramentall signe: I will now content my selfe onely to oppose this; that this Imagination, that *significancy* maketh a Ceremony to bee evill, doth not appearre to mee to haue entred the heart of any learned man, Jew or Christian, till it was of late taken vp against our Ceremonies for a Couert; for this I am sure of, that the Jewes had of their owne devising aboue (as Master Cartwright saith) twentie for one, more then wee haue of Ecclesiasticall significant Ceremonies. Of the ancient Christian Churches, it is rather to bee lamented (as Augustine in his time did) that they ouerdid, in having so many; then needfull to bee proued that all Churches had some such significant Rites. And as for the later Churches of our Religion, some haue more, some as many, some fewer then wee; but all, some. And that the judgement of the Churches in their Confessions, and of the prime men which haue written, is for the allowance of some significant Ceremonies *meereley Ecclesiasticall*,

\* See in the  
Archb. Def.  
pag. 20. his  
words.

*Epist. 8. pag.  
311. Tom. 3.  
opuscul. 2.  
14.82.*

*a Adversus fratrem Baldwinum  
in opuscul. vol.  
3. p. 324. E-  
pist. 12.  
b Epist. 12. O-  
pusc. Tom. 3.  
p. 220.  
c Epist. 12. pa.  
219. & Epist.  
8. p. 212.*

*Vrsin. Carech.  
impref. Ann.  
1623. p. 772.*

though they thinke (as I doe) the fewer the better, is ma-  
nifest. Only Mr. Beza hath a passage which seemeth to  
contrary this which I haue said, namely, *That all symbolicall  
Rites ought to be abolished*: Contrary to what we had of Mr.  
Calvin, that some such are to bee allowed, as a profitable helpe  
to the ruder sorte of men. But these two learned men differ  
not, iauie in shew; for *Calvin*, by symbolicall Rites, meaneth  
such onely as are vied to signifie some *duty* to bee done.  
And *Beza* meaneth such symbolicall Rites as were vied not  
merely for *signification*, but as hauing some *operative vertue*  
in them, either *ex opere operato*, vpon the very doing of them  
as the *Crosse*; or by meanes of their *Consecration* by prayers.  
This to bee so, I proue by *Beza* himselfe in his 8. and 12.  
*Epistles*; from one whereof this *Objection* is taken. For *Be-  
za* confesseth the *a Crossing* to haue beeene sometimes of (at  
least) tolerable use; yea, and now, the Superstition being re-  
moved. *Kneeling*, sometimes a profitable signe *b* of Godly  
reuerence in receiving the *Sacrament*. The vse of the *c Sur-  
plice*, to bee *ex se, res media*, of it selfe a matter indiffer-  
tent; yea, and so the other two. Wherfore, hee did not judge  
*moore Signification* to haue defiled or tainted them, for then  
their vse had never beeene allowable or *indifferent*. There-  
fore this exception against our Ceremonies, that *they are  
significant*, was not verely the cause of the quarrell; but the  
quarrell of this exception. And now I returne, that *the  
Church hath Commission to determine of Ecclesiasticall Rites*,  
which in truth shall appeare to her upon due consideration to be of  
necessary use, whether per se or per accidens, of themselves or  
by accident, unto the edification of it selfe, by Rites vscd for  
Order, and Decency: and when need is, significant. And thus  
much the very definition of a Ceremony, which *Paracelsus*  
hath, may witnesse; when of Church Cereimonies, he saith,  
*That they are externall and solemn Actions instituted in the ec-  
clesiastical Ministry, Ordinis vel Significationis gratia, for  
order or significations sake, which he maketh, after, two sorts,  
Divine and Humane*. Now I come to your *Questions*, which  
I will answer to in short.

C A P.

C A P. X V I I .

Six Questions about Kneeling answered.

Quest. 1. VV Hether you allow Kneeling to bee worship.

*Answ.* Worship is either *Cultus Servit*, or *Adoration* or *Veneration*: kneeling is a part of external Adoration per se in it selfe, as is the being bare-headed; but, not *Cultus ex se*, service or worship of it selfe, but *per aliud*, with reference to another thing, as it is a signe of true internall reuerence acknowledged to God, and a part of that comeliness which becometh men in partaking the seales of the Covenant of grace, done to his honour. It is in it selfe no more then a *Circumstance* of worship, like as Fasting is, of *Humiliation* and *Prayer*; in a word, *Cultus reductio non proprie dictus*, worship reduplicately, not properly so called; lawfull, not commanded, as before hath bee shewed.

Object. But, if this bee not worship, there is no worship of the body?

I Answer, yes; for the very bodily Action of *Eating* and *Drinking* in the Supper, is, on the Receiuers part, *Cultus des externus*, external worship of God, because commanded. So is the bodily speaking in *preaching* and *prayer* publickely. Howbeit I confess, that, of the gestures, there is no bodily worship, i.e. *Cultus Dei ex se*, worship in and of themselves: Nor, *religious Adoration*, but *ex intentione*, in respect of intention onely: For, God hath not differenced *Divine* and *Civil* Adoration by gesture; yet is ours *religious*, in this use.

Quest. 2. Whether, if it bee; it may be lawfull for men to prescribe anything of it, to any other action of worship then is warrantable, either by Precept, or Example.

*Answ.* That which all men might of themselves lawfully doe in the Action of Gods worship, the Gouernours of the Church and Magistrate may lawfully require to bee done of them all, i.e. So, as they might lawfully haue done it *libera conscientia* with a free conscience. Indeed if God had tyed it onely to some one ordinance of his, by *Precept*, neither men, nor Angels might translate it. Warrant by *Example*

you haue before, from the vse of Gods people in severall sorts of his worship. And that the *Eucharist* it selfe is an Action of divine worship, who dare deny? But I take no examples to bee warrauns to vs further then they are warranted by the *Word*.

*Quest. 3.* *VVhere the Church hath power ginen to it, to ordaine any Ceremony?* Indeed it hath power to direct and take care for Decencie and Order, *i. Cor. 14. 40.* But order is no Ceremony, nor Action, but the accommodation of *Vbi, Quando, Prius, Posteriorius, and necessary circumstances* to such actions as bee prescribed.

*Answ.* I haue immediately declared the Churches commission out of *i. Cor. 14. 26. 40.* and shewed how, for the reason of *Order, Decencie and Edification*, the Church must needs ordaine some Ceremonies. For if at all there be none, Religion (as touching the solemnity of it) will come to bee *Vide Chamier.* as some haue said (which Chamier also obserues) as it were *To. T. Paristrat.* but a name. And if such things as need to bee done for *Order, and Decencie* bee not settled (as *Calvin sheweth, Inst. 4. n. 18.*) all will be dissolved.

The late devise of *circumstances*, I haue houghed before. Even the *Place* for publicke worship; and, *houre of meeting* (which men would haue to bee nothing but *circumstances*, as they are designed to that speciall vse) are Ceremonies, not *qua sunt*, sed *qua inserviunt cultui sacro*, as they are subseruente to divine worship. Therefore doth Zanchie call them, *Ceremonies*. And if *place and time*, as they fall vnder such obseruation, bee no Ceremonies, then neither the *Tabernacle* nor *solemne Feasts* were Ceremonies. These were, I confess, *Divine*, as commanded; those are, in their particular determination, *Humane*; yet, *Ceremonies*, in their vse and reference to the worship then and there to be done to God.

*Quest. 4.* *VVhether it bee any lesse then Idolatrie to annex grace unto any thing save unto Gods owne Ordinances, which our Declaration seemes to doe, acknowledging the Ceremonies profitable to *Edification*, and stirring vp of our dull mindes to minde holy duties; unless wee say, *Edification, and quickening of the heart* bee no Graces.*

*Answ. It*

*Answ.* It is *Idolatria interpretationis*, interpretative idolatry to ascribe to any creature (yea, though sanctified by Gods ordinance) the efficiency of grace, which none can worke as a cause thereto, efficiently, but God. But it is neither idolatry, nor vnbeseeming vs, to acknowledge any meane by which grace is wrought through the power of God, nor wrapped in them, but resident in himselfe that freely giueth the grace by the right vse of them. This wee ascribe to Gods Sacraments, but not to Church ceremonies.

The Declaration, you speake of, onely faith, that *some* of our Ceremonies are apt: it doth not say, *able* to stirre vp our dull mindes; and, not apt to doe that, by any *verine* in them, or from God by them to vs; but onely, as *externall objects* and *occasions* whereby our minds worke vpon themselues; for it is said, *by some notable and speciaall signification*.

Chamier shall resolute this, who hath these words. *Negue Cham de Ca-*  
*enim nullus sanus affernit omnia in Scripturis contineri qua mo-*  
*mentum aliquod habent ad fidem & pietatem animos informandos,* none. lib. 9.  
cap. 20. s. 40.  
p. 337;  
*sed duntaxat omnia dogmata fidei & pietatis. Prater hac autem,*  
*plurima sunt, in quibus non est nullum eiusmodi momentum, nor*  
*did euer sound Divine affirme all things to bee contained in*  
*Scriptures which haue any vse at all for information of*  
*mens minds touching faith and piety; but onely that all doc-*  
*trines of faith and piety are there: But besides these (doc-*  
*trines) there are very many things which are not of no mo-*  
*ment vnto vs: Vnamulta naturalia, in quibus authorem mundi*  
*licet agnoscere; in Ecclesia, Ritus & Ceremoniae, as many natu-*  
*rall things, in which wee may learne to acknowledge the*  
*Creator of the world; in the Church Rites and Ceremonies.*  
Where you see that, as vnto Gods creatures, so vnto Eccle-  
siasticall Rites and Ceremonies not contained in the word, hee  
graunteth some furtherance to faith and piety not efficienter,  
as an efficient, but obiective, by way of object. And Calvin  
requireth, that Ceremonies made for decorum, comeliness,  
should bee such as breed a veneration of Gods ordinances, to  
the end that *salibus adminiculis ad pietatem excitemur*, by  
such helpes wee might bee excited vnto piety. At whose  
words, any man that will, may quarrell as iustly, as at our *De-*  
*Calv. Inst. 4.*  
10. 28.  
*clara-*

claration. And indeed, all Ceremonies that some way are not  
apt to edifie vs are unprofitable; and yet, the effecting of grace  
may not bee ascribed to any such.

Quest. 5. I desire to know whether our Ceremonies bee not  
within the compasse of those things that perish with the vsing  
(i.e. that leue no grace, or ought else behind them) which are  
according to the commandementes of men, and if they bee, how we  
can submit our selues to their bondage, contrary to the Apostles  
prescription?

Col. 2.

Answ. I take not our Ceremonies to be within the com-  
pass of those things, of which the Apostle saith, *they perish  
in the vsing* (i.e. they come to no such vse or end as is aimed  
at in them) because those (as Zanchie sheweth) were such  
obseruances as men devised, or vied, with an estimation of  
worshiping God in them *ex se* as of themselves, and that the  
conscience is imbondaged to that superstition. For that,  
being downe right will-worship (when, to Gods owne pre-  
cept, other things were added by men, as necessary, and bin-  
ding the conscience, as Zanchie saith) could yeld nothing to  
men but their labour for their paines. Like as, in Matb. 15.  
*In vaine they worship mee, teaching for doctrine (i.e. imposing  
vpon the conscience) mens Traditions; as if they could not  
be left, without sinne.* For the tradition was, that to eat with  
*unwasben hands, defiled a man as much as whoredome.*

But in vsing Rites and Ceremonies prescribed for order,  
decency and edification, not as necessary in themselves at all,  
nor as any worship of God *per se*, by and of themselves, nor  
as binding the conscience, *extra easum scandali & contemp-*  
*tu*, without the case of scandale and contempt, wee attaine  
the end of our obseruance, which is, the discharge of our  
duties to our Gouernours, the peace of the Church, and our  
Ministry. And the Church obtaineth her end, that the ser-  
vice of God is outwardly so ordered. And if the ordinan-  
ces of God bee, by mens prejudice, not the more regarded,  
but rather the lesse; or, that they which need not the helpe  
of such externall Rites, shall despise them; or, others,  
through carelesnes or ignorāce shal make no vse of any such  
*Memorian* as is, by a Ceremony, presented to their remem-  
brance;

brance ; yet shall the fruite remaine to vs, according to that which wee haue sowed.

Therefore to the second member of this fift Question (which supposeth that which I will not graunt) I need not Answer. But, on the contrary, pray you to consider, if by the Tradition onely of men, without any word of God, wee shall say to our selues, *Weare not a linnen Garment in Gods seruice, make not the signe of the Croffe in B·pissme, kneele not when you receive the Communion* ; for, if you doe, God shall bee disbaoured and offended with you : for, such and such good men say so ! I now demand, if this bee not to imbondage our selues vnto the tradition of men, which say (as it is there) *touch not, taste not, handle not* ; and so bind our consciencies where God hath left them free. Verely, I cannot see but such feare of God is in vaine, because, by, and from the onely precepts of men ; and all that is so done, perisheth in the vsing ; and though God in mercy may, and will forgiue this sinne of their ignorance, yet they can for this haue no reward of God ; for, who required this at their hands ? Standeth the kingdome of God in such things, or his scruice ? I conclude in the words of Chamer, *Nam quia noluit spiritus quicquam oneris imponere Ecclesie, in rebus quidem indifferenteribus, certo qui iisdem sine usurpandis sine casendis legem ponit*, because the spirit would not impose any burden on the Church in things indifferent, certaintly hee that imposeth a Law touching either the *using* or shunning of those things : (i.e. as hee hath before interpreted, as *binding the conscience*) *Hunc necesse est per consequentiam contradicere legibus priuis positis, viz. Deut. 4. 2. and Deut. 12. Non addes, &c.* It must needs bee that such an one by consequence doth contradict those lawes imposed of God, *thou shalt not add to, &c.*

Quest. 6. I desire to know, whether wee may with good Conscience, suffer the making of Gods Commandements voyd by our owne Traditions, as wee doe in pressing these Ceremonies with so much violence, and inflicting such sharpe punishments on the neglect of them, and passing by Adultery and Drunkennesse, &c. as veniall sinnes.

Answe. I take your meaning to bee, by the Traditions of men,

Tom. 4.lib. 13.  
cap. 14. f. 16.

men, when you say [by our owne Traditions,] and that you meane [as they, or some doe,] when you say [as wee doe in pressing them.] For, wee that are called onely to the obseruation, whether Private men or Ministers are pressed, but presse them not. And then I answer. 1. That the pressing of lesser duties, more then greater, *ceteris paribus* is a sinne, which wee may not suffer to goe without Censure, or Reproefe, when we haue opportunity. But that we should resist it by not observing the lesser dutie, because they sinne who presse it more then a greater, will not hold. For of those that did so, and are for so doing reprooved, our Lord saith, *These greater things ye ought to haue done, and not to haue left the other undone.* Math. 23.23.

If you object, That sything of Mints and Cumin were duties contained in the Law, but ours bee Ceremonies instituted by men. I grant that difference; but yet lay, that if they be such as haue allowance in the Word as lawfull, the obseruation of them is a dutie on our part to bee performed for Conscience sake, though not of the thing for it selfe, (as in all things commanded of God) yet for Conscience sake of obedience to our Prince and Gouvernours, whom, in lawfull things God hath commanded vs to obey. So I take it to be a dutie to doe this; though, a greater dutie (because immediately commanded) and simply necessary at all times, to abstaine from whoredome and drunckenesse &c.

2. I answer, that a lesser fault in it selfe, may sometimes be justly more punishable then a greater; as when a greater is confessed, and a lesser defended; or, when hee that hath power to inflict grievous penalties in the lesser case, hath not Commission to doe so in the greater, which is our Bishops case, wherein the fault is in the Lawes, not in the Judges. And 3. That a thing which is in it selfe the lesser evill, may be for the consequence the greater; as, stealing of grapes in the Palatinate, is worse then Burglary, or breaking of an house in the night, though a man steale not to the value of six pence, is more obnoxious then stealing an herd of cattell with vs. Which I speak not to excuse any man, who willingly doth pursue these lighter matters more eagerly then

See D Ames  
his Booke of  
Conscience, p<sup>a</sup>.  
304. s. 6. first  
Edition.

then the more important ; but to shew , that your rule of greater and lesser, must be vnderstood *ceteris paribus*, with respect to circumstances, and not absolutely.

4. I answer, that though it be a sinne not to be suffered without reproote, to presce the lighter things more eagerly then the more important; yet doth not that necessarily make voyd the Commandement of God , but onely misplace it. The making voyd of Gods commaund by mans Tradition, is, when men of themselues appoynt something to be done, which may discharge the conscience from the bond of that which God hath commaunded. And this was the case of which our Lord spake , *Thus you make the Commandement of Marke 7.11. God of none effect*; namely, because they taught, that if a man had once sworne by the Offering, that his father or mother should haue nothing by him, That this oath should free him from the Conscience of honouring (with any reliefe) his father or mother.

Indeed if our Ceremonies were so delivered vnto vs, we ought not to suffer them, but to reprove the tender of them, and reject the vse. Yea if at all they were delivered by our Church as *necessary in themselves*, or as *proper parts* of the service of God in which we vse them ; or, not as *meere Rites* of indifferent nature , and *moouable* at the Churches pleasure, and such as (were it not for Order, Discipline, & Peace sake in the Church) we might, without any offence to God, as well leaue, as vse. For though this Condition should not make void any one of the ten commandments, as did that of the Iewes, yet because it is contrary to the Law which forbiddeth all addition to it selfe , that is, as *Chamiser* faith, to bind the Conscience *per se*, by and of it selte, we might not suffer that impietie to passe without contradiction ; nor, by our Conformity countenance such a superstition.

And as this is true on that hand, so is it on the other, that if any man, how holy, learned, or good soever, shall deliver this tradition to men (not hauing any word of God for himselfe) *You may not weare a Surplice in Gods Service* , nor *make the signe of the Crosse at Baptisme on the childs forehead* , nor *kneele in receiving the Lords Supper* ; for if you doe, you shall

sin against God, and dishonour him, and it will one day lyce on your Conscience as a sinne: I may not suffer such a superstition without reprove, nor yeeld any practise to the command or direction of this humane Tradition, for the very same reason. For, as it is superstition *de rebus medijs in utramq; partē statuere*, in things indifferent to make peremptory lawes on either hand, either that it must of necessitie be so done in obedience to God; or, it must not bee so done, for direct obedience to God, as the onely Lord of the Conscience: So it is my dutie, without partialitie on either hand, to shew my dislike of their contrary superstitions.

Nor can it bee said, that the one side doth vrge Conformatie more eagerly then the other doth Inconformatie. For they vrge Inconformatie directly for Conscience sake to God, and affirme, that it is *Ignorance*, or *an ill Conscience* in any man to vse them, or both: whereas the other vrge them not at all to be vſed for any Conscience sake, or necessitie in themselves, but onely for Conscience sake, because they are determined and imposed as matters of *Order*, and *externall government* by lawfull authoritic.

Indeed the Church-Officers inflict more grievous penalties vpon the refusall of these, as hauing authoritic of Law. But the other, at least some of them, inflict deeper wounds, by casting all men which *conforme*, out of the hearts & good opinion of all they can, as time-servuers, belly-gods, and what you will else that naught is. Nor is the *Suspension* of a Minister (in my conceit) a smarter stroake then the *suspension of the Lords Sacrement* from being received, vnlesse the gesture of sitting or standing may be yeelded to them.

I lament the pressure of either side (if it could be holpen) with all my heart, and yet must remember this proverbe, *Crudelem Medicum intemperaks ager facit*, the intemperance of the Patient, puts the Physician vpon an harsh course of cure. The Lord God of Peace and Mercy, guide our hearts and minds in the way and Rody of truth and peace.

C A P. 19.  
The Objection from Christ's example,  
answered.

Opp. ¶ He Arguments against Kneeling, taken from Christ's Example, Table-gesture, Idolatrous introduction, prohibition to fall downe before a consecrated creature, I confess have not moued me much. That which I desire to be satisfied in concerning this gesture, is, First &c.

Answ. If you had said, these Argumenes had not moved you at all, I would of them haue said nothing. But lest they might at all tollicite your thoughts, I will say something of each of them in order.

As for Christ's Example, if it binde to that gesture which he vied, then it bindeth to lying along. For what ever is to be done by paterne, must be cut iust to the paterne, or else it is not done so. For, that Christ did so eat the Pascouer with his Disciples; and the Disciples so parake the Communion in that gesture which our Lord *non tam instituit quam retinuit in Cœna*, not which hee instituted, but rather continued, is by all the learned on that side confessed. Altare Damasc. p. 745. M<sup>r</sup>. Answ. Annot. in Exod. 12. Amongst whom this is a rule, that such things as our Lord then did occasionally, are ( Altar. Damasc p. 741 ) no examples to vs to binde vs to the like, and therefore (say they) wee are not tyed to the night, or to after supper; or to unleavened bread; or to washing of feet, or to the sex, or number of Communicants: which is well sayd. But, say I, that gesture was as occacionall as the rest: for it was the custome and Ecclesiasticall Ordinance of the Iewes, to eat the Paschall-Feast so, lying along on beds, in token of the rest which God had now given them in their owne land, which being a profitable Ceremony, our Lord himselfe observed it, and continued the use of it in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, though it was a gesture vsed in the Pascouer; that he might teach vs, by his Example, not to bee scrupulous about gestures, but to conforme our selues to the lawfull customes of the people of God where we are. So, Christ's Example is for vs.

## C A P. 20.

The objection from a Table-gesture answered.

**T**HE Table-gesture urged, doth crie downe the Argument from Christs Example. For if the thing required a Table-gesture, by nature of it selfe, then must we not ground it vpon any examples, but refer the examples to the Table gesture, as the ground thereof. Nor was that gesture of *distributus*, lying along with the Iewes a common table-gesture, but vsed onely at the *Sacrifice*, or *Sacred Feasts*, saith *Aliaro Damasc.* which is much for vs, as intimating that it is comely and convenient in our feasting before the Lord, euen in the gesture of the body, or manner of vsing it, to shew and witnesse, that wee are not at a common Table; for the Iewes vsed this gesture freely at their *Sacrifice-Feasts*, not at their common supper or meales; and tyed themselves to it strictly onely in the *Paschall Supper*, that no other might then bee vsed, without breach of their *Constitutions*. This our Lord followed.

*Aliaro Damasc.*  
pag. 743.

*Aliaro Damasc.*  
pag. 765.

*ibid. lib. fol.*  
17.

They which urge this Argument most, confess that it is not fit or lawfull to vse all other Formalities of a common table at the Lords Table. And therefore the vse of a common table-gesture, urged by some of them so far, as to say to Receive kneeling is not to receive the Lords Supper, is a most unreasonable straine full of Faction, & not free of Superstition. For any gesture in case of necessitie, any comely gesture accompanied with manifest signes of Reverence, is, no doubt, Lawfull in publike; and no one, by any *divino* Law, necessary: therefore determinable by the Churches of God, as an indifferent Rite. Doth Christ heed vs, whether wee take it sitting, standing, or kneeling? saith *Oecolampadius*.

## C A P. 21.

The Objection from Idolatrous introduction  
answered.

**T**HE third Argument from *Idolatrous Introduction*, is a poore one; yea, if it were granted that Antichrist, euen in his

in his height, had brought in this Rite of *kneeling* when we receive, for adoration of the Sacrament. For his misapplying of that gesture to the honour of a creature, as if it were God, cannot make the vse of the like gesture unlawfull to vs in the worshipping of the true God, who condemning all bowing before an Idoll, hath required it to himselfe in his externall seruice, though not with determination with what kinde of bowing. And if the Popes abuse of *kneeling* haue made *kneeling* unlawfull, then the *Arian*s abuse of *sitting* at the Lords Supper in neglect of Christ, and to shew themselves as it were his companions, should make *sitting* (not being *instinated* of Christ) to bee also unlawfull. Yet the Councils of *Cracovia, Udalstattia, Peterborne, and Seadan* (cited in the *Altar of Damasc. Latine*, pag. 751.) did not condemne *sitting* for this abuse of the *Arian*s, as unlawfull to be vsed in the Lords Supper, but onely disswade all of their societie to vse it, leauing to them as indifferent standing or *kneeling*. And, till of very late, those which spake most against our vse of *kneeling*, were not so rash as to count it unlawfull; but onely, for the abuse or perill which might possibly ensue, *Inconvenient*. So *Beza*, so *M. Cartwright*.

2. But I deny that the gesture of *kneeling* when wee doe receive the Communion, was brought into the Church by Antichrist, i. e. the *Bishop of Rome*, as is pretended; or had any Idolatrous introduction, whatsoever may, since the introduction, haue befallen it.

The *Adoration* of the Sacrament wee know to haue beeene brought into the Romane Church, after the determination of *Transubstantiation*. For that Decree was at the Council of *Lateran*, 1215. vnder *Innocent. 3.* But, *Adoration*, about the yeare of our Lord, 1226. But *Honorius* did not appoint the *Adoration* to be vsed in the *act of receiving*, but at the *Elevation*, when, say they, Christ is offered vp as an heane-offering by the Priest; or, when it was carried through the streeets to the sicke. And to encrease the belief of Christ's reall presence vnder the *Species* of the Bread, the *Feast of Corpus Christi-day*, and *Indulgences* were after graunted by two other Antichrists succeding *Honorius*. But none of these

Lib. 3. Decret.  
tit. de Celebra-  
tione Missæ.  
cap. 3. id. i.e.  
Tit. 4. cap. 1.

made any Decree for Adoration of the Sacrament, at, and in the very time of receiving it, but when it was Eleuated, or carried abroad to the sick, or in Pompe.

*Alius Damascenus*  
p. 783.

2. Neither was the Decree of Honorius for Kneeling, to it or before it, but onely for bowing of the body to it reverently. As the Disputer against Kneeling, and *Alius Damascenus* doe rightly obserue. But that *Alius Damascenus* saith, this bowing to it was in signs onely of veneration, such as to *Images*, not of divine Adoration; that is, without reason, said and conceiued onely in fauour of his fancied difference of Veneration & Adoration, made by the very outward signes or gestures. For the reason of decreeing bowing and not of kneeling to the Sacrament, could not bee because they would not giue divine honour to that which they beleued to bee God, but because the ancient Decree of *not Adoring* openly and solemnly on their knees, no not in prayer on the *Lords dayes*, and the Pentecost, would not permit the gesture of kneeling openly and solemnly to bee obserued in the Churches for Adoration of the Sacrament.

So that so long as that Decree for standing in their publicke seruice kept any life in it, there was no decree for Adoration of the Sacrament, by kneeling to or before it.

Indeed since that time the Church of Reme hath changed the gesture of bowing to that of kneeling: The Priest when hee hath consecrated each Species, and let them downe vpon the Altar, must now by the Canon of the Mass adore the Sacrament Kneeling. And so all the people must now doe at the Eleuation, &c.

Thus wee confesse Kneeling before and to the Hoaste, to haue come in by Antichrist, when midnight was vpon the face of the world, and Antichrist in his height. But wee waite for some evidence to prove, first that Antichrist brought in the Rite or Ceremony of Kneeling in the *Act* of receiving the Sacrament. And secondly, that Kneeling so brought in, was intended as any signe of Adoration of the Sacrament, or Christ as ex stent vnder the formes of bread and wine.

Pag. 783.

*Alius Damascenus* boldly telleth vs, that with vs, *Ide-*  
*ritus*

risus, eadem momento, eadem forme, eadem acta usurpatum, quo apud Pontificios, adeo ut externa specie ne hinc quidem diffirent, the same rite, in the same moment of time, in the same forme, in the same act is vsed, as is among the Pontificians; so that in respect of outward species or forme they differ not at all.

He forgetteth himselfe somewhat; for with vs, the Bps. or Ministers communicate Kneeling, as well as the people.

But with them, the Pope, when himselfe performeth the office, receiueth sitting, as being a type of Christ, the Masspriests receive standing reverently, by the Canon of the Masse. See Ordo Rom. apud Bibl. Pat. Col. To. 8. pag. 399. column. I. B. Edit. Colon. 1618.

The people indeed receive it Kneeling as wee doe. But before the gesture of Kneeling can bee proued to bee of Idolatrous introduction by Antichrist after the Transubstantiation, as is vrged, three things must bee shewed. First, that the Rite and gesture of Kneeling in the Act of receiving, is, and hath beeene in the Church of Rome it selfe alwayes idolatrous, i.e. done, or to bee done in Adoration of the visible Sacrament it selfe. Secondly, that some Pops did bring it in. And thirdly that, since the Transubstantiation: in all which, hee will be to seeke.

For graunting that the people doe Kneele in receiving, (as did also the Priest, till such time as the doctrine of Transubstantiation begot the Canon of his standing, for feare of seducing ought) I deny, that Kneeling in the very time of Receiving, was euer in the Church of Rome any Rite of, or for Adoration of the Sacrament it selfe, or any creature, and therefore not Idolatrous. I deny not the errore of their mindes concerning that they received into their mouthes. But I deny, that they euer intended Adoration of the Species, at that moment of time when they tooke it in their mouthes: But then turned theenselues to God rather, to give him thankes, which was not vncomely.

My reasons are first, because it was never yet enjoyned by any Pope that they should then Kneele. Nor is this gesture of Kneeling any of the Romane Rites, nor so mentioned by Bellar. de Missa. lib. 2. c. 15. Nor in the Rubrike of the Masse-booke, which telleth vs of standing, sitting, knocking,

bowing and kneeling; and when they must bee. Nor euer mentioned by Durandus, or Duranus, who write of all the Rites and Ceremonies which are of vse by any institution in that Church or haue bee. Secondly, because so often as in the Masse, *Adoration to the Sacrament* is to bee performed by Priest, or people, it is in plaine termes said, *let him or them then adore the Sacrament.* But it is not said so at the time and moment of receiving; but on the contrary, when it is carried to bee giuen to the sick, the direction is, *to let him have a sight of it, that he may first adore it, if hee will;* which sheweth that they doe not esteeme any signe of reverence to bee giuen for *Adoration of the Sacrament* when it is received, but only when it is on purpose looked upon. Thirdly, for that it is an incongruous thing in their superstition, to *Adore* a thing which is not higher then their pollcs when they adore it, because they cannot bee said to humble themselves to that which is lower then they can cast themselues. And hence Master Adorison telleth of one in Sanoy, brought in daunger of punishment, for doeing his reverence to the Host carried by, out at a window, when hee was higher then it, for this was *despicere Sacramentum*, to disregard or despise the Sacrament.

I conclude therefore, that it is impossible to proue, that the gesture of Kneeling at that moment of receiving the Sacrament, was in the very Church of Rome idolatrously intended to the Sacrament.

And as touching the *Instruction* thereof by any Pope, I also deny that to bee proued, or probable (if meaning) of kneeling with respect to the Sacrament in the very moment of receiving it. For there is not to this day, any decree of any Pope or Councell, so much as that it should bee taken Kneeling of all the Communicantes, much lesse for *Adoration* of the Sacrament it selfe.

*Altare Damascenum* allead geth out of the Romish Riteall,  
*Postea ad communionem accedit, incipiens ab ijs qui sunt ad par-*  
*tem Epistola, sed priuatis sacerdotibus vel alijs ex clero danda est*  
*communio, ijs ad gradus Altaris genu flexis tribuantur: vel si*  
*commodo fieri potest, intra sepimentum Altaris sine à laicis*  
*distincti;*

*distincti, sacerdos vero sum soli communicens.* Then hee goes to the Communion, beginning from those who are on the Epistles side: but first, if the Communion bee to bee given to the Priests or others of the Clergy, let it bee administered to them kneeling at the steps of the Altar; or, if it may conueniently be done, let the Priests bee distinguisched from the Laicks by being within the railles of the Altar, but then let the Priests communicate alone. Such another I find alleadged by M. Morison \*. And a third I remember in <sup>\* Quo supra.</sup> the Order of Salamanca for the Fryers. But all these concerne <sup>pag 69.</sup> onely the Clergy, who comming to receive so neare the Altar, are appointed to doe it *kneeling* on the greeches or steps of the Altar, which is done in *veneration* of the Altar, or of that which standeth thereupon, and not for Adoration to the *Hoast* when it is put into their mouthes, and is not giuen as a rule to all the people whereuer they communicate, or when it is communicated to them.

But it will bee perhaps objected, That *the people of all sorts doe receive kneeling in their Churches.* I graunt it, but I deny that euer it was by any Pope, since the *Transubstantiation*, devised or imposed vpon them as a *Rite* or *Ceremony* to bee obserued in *receiving*. For then, wee should surely either find *when*, and by *whom*; or, at least, that it was done, or had not beeene so before, which I doe not beleue that any man can shew.

And the reason why there never was any constitution made in the Romane Church for this gesture, was, as I conjecture three fold. 1. Because if they had made, til of later ages, such a Law, they had openly crossed the ancient Rite and Canons made against *Kneeling on the Lords-dayes and Pentecost*, in any their solemnme worship of God. Therefore they rather liked to winke at the closer breach of that Canon, by such as out of priuate devotion shoul'd *kneele*, when their turne came to *receive*, on those dayes of Station, then to cross it by another Canon expressly. Secondly, because they found all men out of a generall devotion and desire of honouring God in that action, of themselves to *kneele*, they did not find any need, to require that to bee done, which

was vniuersally done of the people, by an ancient Custom. And thirdly, because this which had beeue obserued of old times, before their new conceit of a Reall presence, seemed to give better testimony to that conceit, then if the Ceremony had been by themselves instituted. And indeed this we find, that when the doctrine of Reall presence by Consuſtantiation, began to get head, which was aboue 100. yeares before the Transuſtantiation, the Patrons of that error did plead the Adoration, which had beeue generally obſerued in the uſe of the Supper before that (but with intendment of the same to Christ the Sonne of God, as ſitting in heauen, and not as exiſtent in or with the bread) to proue the Reall presence thereby. For <sup>a</sup> Suarez saith, as the Reall presence proueth the Adoration a priori, so the Adoration proueth the reall presence a posteriori.

*a. In tertiam  
partem Thoma  
Tom. 3. pag.  
781.*

*b. Alger. de  
Sacram. Alm-  
ri. lib. 2.c. 3.*

Thus <sup>b</sup> Algerus, who liued aboue a hundred yeares before the Transuſtantiation, or voydancē of the ſubſtance of bread was resolute of ; but yet, when a Reall presence of Chrifts body, in, and with the bread was apprehended ; vt̄ eth his matter, laying, *Cassa eſt veneranda ſedulitas Adorantium & venerantium, &c.* the venerable ſedulity of ſuch as adore and worship is in vaine, if Christ bee not there : And after, *Wee Adore the Sacrament it ſelſe, Sacramentum iþum adoramus tanquam diuinum quiddam, as a diuine thing, and ſpeakē to it as to a living and intelligent thing. O lambe of God that takeſt awaie the ſinnes of the world, &c. Quia non quod videtur, ſed quod vere eſt, Christum ibi effe creamus,* because wee beleeue Christ to bee there, not in ſhew, but in truthe. Wherein, however hee doe peruerter the cuſtomary fashion of the Church in receiuing this Sacrament *Adoramus* adoring it, referring it to the Sacrament it ſelſe ; and misinterpret those words of the Canon, *O lambe of God, &c.* which were intended to Christ himſelfe in heauen, and not as locally in the Sacrament, (as Strabo ſheweth) uſed in the time of the breaking of the bread for the Communicants ; yet thus much is manifest, that before his time the Church, as hee speaketh, generally did uſe Adoration of Christ himſelfe in celebrating thofe myfteries. And in his time, and after, before the Tran-

*W. Strabo in  
Bibl. patr. Co-  
lon. To. 9. p.  
961. i. c. cap.  
23. de rebus  
Ecclesiasticis,  
&c. Florus, a*

*sub-*

*Substantiation*, they did Adore Christ as coexistent with the bread, which perhaps gave occasion to *Aurelius* (who lived eightie yeares before *Honorius*) to say that *Christians did ador their God, and then eat him*. For, at that time, the error of *Consubstantiation* had gotten strength, and they did as it were confine the locall presence of Christ to the bread once sanctified, at least in the Sacramentall vse of it, and did performe divine honour to the Sonne of God as being therein. Not yet intending to ador that which was seene, but that which was taken to bee therein (*ut contentum in contingen-  
tia*) ineffably there, yet (*ibi*) there. The difference betwixt these and the former ages was, in this, That the former Ages did, in receiuing the Sacrament, c Adoring, as Aug said, not  
mystically, as the signified thing is in the Signe, without any opinion of Christ's bodily presence in the creatures them-  
selves, or of alteration made in the substance, nature or forme of the creatures; whereas, that Age dreamed of a *Consub-  
stantiation*. The following, did embrace that monster of *Transubstantiation*; and then, when all the substance of the visible creature was held to be gone, they did easly turne and enten the Adoration to the visible things, as if there had beeene now no substance of any creature left therein, but only the appearances of familiar creatures, vnder which, Christ himselfe was substantially; but invisible.

That there was this difference, the writings of the severall Ages will manifest to any diligent Reader; and among other things, this clause (which is kept, I confess, still; though stripped of the sense it had) that, *in celebrating or consecrating, the prayer was not made, that the Bread and Wine might bee made the body and blood of Christ in themselves, as is now fassied; but, Ut nobis accipientibus sicut corpus & sanguis Domini, to vs receiving of them they may become the body and blood of the Lord.* Intimating that the Real presence of Christ (in a spirituall manner) is not effected in the visible signes; but, in and unto the faithfull Receiver of them. And that all the conversion and changing of the Bread and Wine was only in their vse, in that they were mystically, and in type, the body and blood of Christ, as the Ark was

Minister who  
liued ann. 860,  
in his Exposi-  
tion of the  
*Masse, Bibl.  
Colom. To. 9.  
pag. 304.*

c Adoring, as  
Aug said, not  
that which is  
seen and per-  
sistent, but that  
which is belie-  
ved; &c.

*Iebrahim, as the Roske was Christ, 1. Corinthians, 10.*

The Adoration therefore of Christ in the use of the Sacrament, hath alwayes bee[n] in the Christian Church; First, without any reference of diuine honour to the visible things themselves as being really turned into Christ, or containing him within themselues. Afterwards, from the prevailing of Guilmund and other against Berengarino, and the truth, for a reall presence of Christ conioyned with the bread, they directed their Adoration to the creatures; but, not for the creatures or Elements sakes, but for Christs sake. At last came in the Adoration of the Sacrament or *visible element* of bread it selfe, as hauing no substance or materiall substance; but onely the naturall Body of Christ by vertue of Consecration, & by Concomitance wholly Christ, who is God to be adored for euer. In the first times and second, the adoration was onely in the use. For out of the Sacramentall use they did not belieue such a Reall presence: but, after the abomination of Transubstantiation once got the field, because there was then nothing of the creature supposed to be left, but the Accidents; and those, as Bellar. himselfe speaketh, united to the person of the Sonne of God. Then followed, that wheresoever that appeared, Divine honour was held fit to bee done thereto, as vnto the very Son of God incarnate, and certainly exis[t]ent vnder those Species of Bread and Wine, as euer he was on the Cresse, or in the wombe of his mother; onely (for feare of frightening vs) hee is pleased to bee there *invisible*, and as after the manner of a Spirit, but yet in his very true naturall body, the same that was crucified, say they. This most abominable Idolatrie followed indeed the Transubstantiation. But the two other sorts of Adoration of Christ in the use of the Sacrament went before this. The middle also was Idolatrous, not *in obiecto*, in the object, as the last, but *interpretative*, because they conceived very Christ to be coexistent, then, with the sanctified Creatures; and as so, adored him, but not the *visible creatures*. The first Adoring was vndoubtedly lawfull, when the sanctified creatures were understood to bee the Body and Blood of Christ, not *in rei veritate*, as being changed the one into the other,

other, or one coexistent with the other, but in significante mysterio, in a signifying mysterie, as August. spake, made the Body and Blood of Christ, not by any alteration of their substance, forme, and nature, as Theodore; but onely by their Institution and Deputation to that vse: and therefore were not the very Body and Blood of Christ, nor did exhibit the same (as was aler dreamed) to the mouth and bodie of euery Receiuer of them, but onely to the soule of the true beleeuers, who received spiritually and by faith, *rem sacramenti*, the thing signified by the outward elements. For all that while, the adoration or divine worship was directed only to Christ as sitting at the right hand of God in heauen, and that in the act of Communicasing.

Hence the 1. Nicene Councell exhorteþ, that men should not bee humiliter intenti, humbly intent to the things before them, but looke vp higher. Hence came into the Lyturgie, *Sursum corda, lift vp your hearts.* Hence many plaine speeches of Saint August. Chrysost. and others, that the Receivers must, as Eagles, mount vp to heauen, and take hold of Christ there: Prepare mentem non ventrem, fidem non dentes, their heart, not their stomacke; faith, not their teeth to receiue Christ himselfe and feed vpon him.

That Adoration preceded Transubstantiation, which was Ann. 1130. defined at the fourth Lateran Councell, Ann. 1215. I shew. In lib de Canonū observantia proposit: 23. prope finem. Tom 11. Bibl. Par. Colon pag. 460. D. col. 1.  
*Inclinatus nuntem dñe antequam communicer, Domine Iesu*  
*Christe qui voluntate patris cooperante Spiritu sancto, permorsus*  
*propriam mundum vivificasti, libera me per hoc sacro-san-*  
*ctum corpus & sanguinem tuum ab omnibus iniquitatibus &*  
*maliis meis, &c. Cum distribuit, dicit, Corpus Domini nostri Iesu*  
*Christi proficiat tibi in vitam eternam, Amen.* The Priest  
 bowing himselfe before hee communiuates, saith thus: O  
*Lord Iesus Christ who by the will of the Father, and the conse-*  
*cration of the Holy Ghost hast quickned the world through thine*  
*owne death, deliver mee by this thy most holy body and blood from*  
*all mine iniquities and evills whatsoever, &c.* And when hee  
 distributeth the Eucharist vnto others, he saith, *The body and*  
*blood*

blood of our Lord Iesus Christ bee available to thee unto eternall life.

*Anno 1090.  
Excat. in Bibl  
Pat. T. II.  
pag. 383. lit. B.  
col. 1. about  
the yeere of  
our Lord, 1090*

In *Micrologus de Ecclesiasticis observationibus*, cap. XVIII. these words, *Orationem quam inclinari dicimus ante quam communicemus, non ex ordine, sed ex religiosorum traditione habemus, scilicet. hanc: Domine Iesu Christe qui ex voluntate patris. Item & illud, Corpus & sanguis Domini Iesu Christi, quod dicimus cum alijs Eucharistiam distribuimus. Sunt & aliae multe precatio[n]es, quas quidem ad pacem & communionem priuata[m] frequentant: sed diligentiores antiquarum traditionum obseruator[es], nos in huiusmodi priuatis orationibus breuitati studere docuerant, potiusque publicis precibus in officio Missa occupari.* That prayer which, bowing our selues, we vse to say before wee communicate, wee haue not by any order, but by tradition of religious men: to wit, this, *O Lord Iesus Christ who by the will of the Father. And this also, The body and blood of the Lord Iesus Christ, which wee lay when wee distribute the Eucharist.* There are also many other prayers which indeed men vse at giving the Pax and priuate communion: but such as are more diligent obseruers of the more ancient traditions, haue taught vs to study breuity in such priuate prayers, and to bee rather busied in the publicke prayers in the office of the Masse.

These two witnessies, and especially the elder of them, *Micrologus*, who dyed aboue a hundred yeares before Transubstantiation was defined, tell vs these things. First, that beside the publicke solemnme prayers, they had sundry priuate. Secondly, that they had a prayer which the Minister vsed to say *Inclinatus*, bowing himselfe immediately before hee received, and another for each Communicant, the same which wee haue. Thirdly, that those prayers were not *ab aliquo ordine*, by any appointment, but of the Tradition of devout men. These testimonies doe proue that they received with Adoration, whether *Inclinati* bowing themselves in their bodies, or on their knees.

For men never knew till now (if any bee so blind to believe it) that kneeling is any more a gesture of Adoration then bowing, *Inclinate capita Deo, bow your heads to God, in*

in Chrysostomes Liturgy was taken to be a posture of Divine Adoration, and not onely Kneeling. Well-tare Vasquez yet, Vasquez de A. The extermal tokens of Adoration, are bowing downe of the body, adoracione lib. vnding the knee, prostration, knocking of the brest, folaing of the cap & num. 36. bands, baring the head, censing, kissing, setting up lights, &c.

But Inclination may agree to Kneeling, or to bowing downe; *Vide Synod. Turon. Can.* And like enough; that on the Station dayes, Lords dayes and Pentecost, they did rather bow, then kneele; I meane, the 37. publicke Ministers; and kneeled on all other dayes when they were by Canon bound to pray Kneeling. In which dayes they also did communicate, and therefore must needs bee understood to receive it Kneeling; for when it was delivered, that prayer was said, *The body of our Lord, &c.*

Yea it is laid by Amalarus, who liued eight hundred yeares before Berengarius his time, and therefore before the decree for Consubstantiation or reall presence in, or with the bread, That according to the Order of the Romane Church, in the end of the Psalms they vsed to say a versicle before the prayer, *Quam solennius facere genua flectendo sine vultum declinando in terram*, which wee are vsed to make kneeling, *Anno 300. Amalar. de Ordine Antiphonar. cap. 52. opus Bibl. Patr. Colon. Toma. 9 part. I pag. 413.* or casting downe our face towards the earth, whereby is manifest that at some prayers euuen in Easter weeke (for of that hee speaketh) they did vse indifferently bowing downe of the head, or kneeling: and therefore did understand the bowing to bee as much a signe of Adoration, as kneeling, and that wee may as reasonably say Inclination kneeling, as it may bee said bowing, or bowed downe.

The storie of Plegilis reported by Rabanus Maurus *Anno 800.* (which is botchingly preeced to Pascha sius his booke, *de corp. & sang. Domini cap. 41.*) Though the thing reported bee like to be a fable, or else was a delusion of Sathan to helpe on the doctrine of the Reall presence, which wasthen in brewing; yet so much of it as serues our turne may bee well alleaged; Namely, when it is said, that when hee was in celebrating the Communion hee pro more procumbebat, according to custome fell on his knees, which sheweth plainly that after the consecration, and before the receiving, the manner was that the Priest fell on his knees. For else would

would not *Rabanus* haue said, *pro more procumbebat.*

These witnesses may (I thinke) serue to allure vs, that at that time, when the *Reall presence* was come into dispute; and after that, till the way of *Transubstantiation* was defined, They did vse to communicate with *Adoration*. And yet it cannot bee shewed that any Bishop of *Rome* did appoint it so to bee.

### C A P. X X I I.

*That in the most ancient times, before corruption of the doctrine of the Sacrament began, the Sacrament was received with adoring Gesture.*

**N**ow, for the more ancient times, in which the doctrine of the Sacrament was the same which ours now is, (as *Orthodoxus Consensus* most largely, and *Duplexis de Missa* and others doe manifest;) I say with that learned Treatise *Dialecticon Eucharistie* confidently, that the Fathers did receive the Sacrament Adoring; Adoring, not the Sacrament but Christ; and to shew this, I will begin as high as I can, and come downe-wards.

\* Cap. 14.

*Tertullian de oratione*\*, after Reproofe of other abuses about prayer, cometh at length to say, *Similiter de stationum diebus, non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interueniendum, quod statio solnenda sit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo, denorum Deo obsequium Eucharistiare soluit, an magis Deo obligat? nonne solennior erit statio tua, si & ad aram Dei steteris? Acceptio corpore Domini & reservato virumque saluum est, & participatio sacrifili, & executio officij. Si statio de militari exemplo nomen accipit (nam & militia dei sumus) utique nulla laetitia, sine (not as it is printed, sine) tristitia obueniens castris stationes militum rescindit. Nam laetitia libentius, tristitia sollicitius administrat disciplinam.* The like of the dayes of station, most thinke they ought not then to come to the prayers of the sacrifices, because station or standing is then to bee performed even in receiving the body of the Lord. But what then, doth the Eucharist discharge that devout dutie (*scil. of pray-*

prayer) which wee owe vnto God, or rather doth it not more oblige vs to him? Shall not thy station bee more solemne, if thou stand at Gods Altar? By taking the body of our Lord and reseruing it (*scil. vncaten*) till thou come home, both duties may bee dispatched, both the participation of his holy Sonne and the execution of thy dutie. If *station* take the name from military fashion (for wee also are Gods army) verely nor either joy or sorrow happening to their tents destroyes the stations of souldiers. For joy doth more cheeretully administer discipline; and sorrow, more carefully.

The place is darke, and must bee opened, before wee can make vse of that Testimony, wherefore first we must know, what the dayes of station doe meane. \* Some take them to bee their fet dayes of Fasting. But that cannot bee. For Tertullian himselfe doth difference them one from another, lib. 3. cap. 4. *ad uxorem*, where shewing the mischiefe and hindrances which a woman shall haue by taking an Infidel to bee her husband (as some then did in their second marriages) hee saith, *Ut si statio facienda sit, Maritus de die conducat ad Balneas: Si ieiunia obseruanda sunt, Maritus eadem die consumnum exerceat, &c.* Where *ieiunia* is not put as an explication of *Statio*, as if they signified one and the same thing: nor is *statio* put for the *Vigils* in the times of their fastings, as *de la Cerdas* on that place, and *Bell. lib. 2. de bon. operib. cap. 22.* would haue it: for those *Vigils* (as the same *Cerdas* and *Bellarmino* there confess) were oonly *de nocte* of the night, not of the day; whereas *Tertullian* speakes expressly of *station* as an act proper to the day time, saying; if a station bee to be performed, the husband may that same day leado her to the *Bathes*; if fastings bee to bee obserued, the husband may the same day hold a *feast*. That Glossie therefore of the *Iewites* is but a dreame. It remaines then, that *Station* is v-sed in a proper not figuratiue sense, to note some solemne act performed in the day time: and that *Statio* and *ieiunia* are put for different things and the *station* is letted by carrying her that day to the *Bathes*; Fasts, by her husbands appointing of a *Feast* that day. Besides, fasting could not bee abso-

\* *De la Cerdas*,  
the Jesuite vp-  
on this place,  
num. 143. and  
151, 152.  
*Bell. lib. 2. de  
bon. oper. cap.  
22. Aliq;*

Tertull. de Co-  
ron. Milis. cap.  
3. Edit. Paris.  
Ann. 1624.

absolutely hindred by going to the *Bathes*: nor *Vigils* at all, by holding a feast in the day, if the *Vigils* were held only in the nights. *Stationum dies* therefore were those dayes wherein (by a Tradition vniuersally received) they stood in prayer, and at all the solemne worship of God: of which Tertullian saith, *Diebus dominicis ieiunare nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare*, wee hold it an heynous thing to fast on the Lords dayes; or, *so adore on our knees*.: *Eadem immuni- tate a die Pascha ad Pentecostem usque gaudemus*, This immunitie wee enjoy from Easter vntill Pentecost. This Ceremony of standing on those dayes, and of not fasting on those dayes, served to expresse their beleefe and joyfull remembrance of our Lords Resurrection from the dead. This is that which Tertullian calleth, *denuoium Deo obsequium*, a devout dutie (or seruice) vnto God. And that Tertull. in this place, by *Station*, where hee saith, *quod statio solvenda sit*, meaneth the very posture or gesture of standing, in the place alleadged; appeareth yet further in the words themselues, when hee saith, *Nonne statio tua sol minor erit, si & ad aram desisteris?* Shall not thy station bee the more solemne, if thou stand at the Altar?

The *Communion-table* then is, after the phrase of that time, called the Altar. The *Sacraments* of Christs body and blood, the *Sacrifices*. The *prayers* vsed in that action, about the blessing or consecration of Bread and Wine to that vse, the *prayers of the Sacrifices*. All which, by the word [*Eucha- ristia*] there vsed, as it were expositiuely, are manifest. Wherfore there can bee no other meaning of Tertullians words alleadged, but this: That on those dayes on which the solemne worship of God, was (by a Tradition called *A- postolicall*) performed standing and not kneeling; Many men, or most men [*plerique*] withdrew themselues, when they came to the celebration of the Supper, because the body of our Lord, that is, the *Sacramentall bread*, being taken of the Ministers hand, *The station*, i. e. standing must be dissolved, or left. And because standing on those dayes might not bee leſt (as they thought) therefore they rather left the *Sacrament* on those dayes, then they would breake the rule of standing on

in Chrysostomes Leitury was taken to bee a positure of D<sup>r</sup>ine Adoration, and not onely Kneeling. Well-fare Vasquez, Vaquez de Ayer, The exterrall tokenes of Adoration, are bowing downe of the dorasone lib. body, bending the knee, prostration, knocking of the brest, cap. 4. num. 36. folding of the bands, baring the head, censing, kissing, setting vpt lights, &c.

But Inclinati may agree to Kneeling, or to bowing downe; And like enough; that on the Station dayes, *Lords dayes and Pentecost*, they did rather bow, then kneele; I meane, the publicke Ministers; and kneeled on all other dayes when they were by Canon bound to pray Kneeling. In which dayes they also did communicate, and therefore must needs bee vnderstood to receive it Kneeling; for when it was deliuered, that prayer was said, *The body of our Lord, &c.*

Yea it is said by Amalarius, who liued eight hundred yeare before Berengarius his time, and therefore before the decree for Consubstantiation or Reall presence in, or with the p<sup>ro</sup>monstris cap. Bread, That according to the Order of the Romane Church, in the end of the Psalms they vied to say a versicle before the prayer, *Quam solenniter facere genit. fletendo sine vultum declinando in terram*, which wee are vied to make kneeling, or casting down our face towards the earth, whereby is manifest that at some prayers even in Easter weeke (for of that hee speaketh) they did vse indifferently bowing downe of the head, or kneeling: and therefore did vnderstand the bowing to bee as much a signe of Adoration, as kneeling, and that wee may as reasonably say Inclinati kneeling, as it may bee said bowing, or bowed downe.

The story of Plegilis reported by Rabanus Maurus Anno. 830, (which is botchingly peeced to Paschasius his booke, *de corp. & sang. Domini*, cap. 41.) Though the thing reported bee like to be a fable, or else was a delusion of Satan to helpe on the doctrine of the Reall presence, which was then in brewing; yet so much of it as serues our turne may bee well alleadged; Namely, when it is said, that when hee was in celebrating the Communion hee pro more procumbebat, according to custome fell on his knees, which sheweth plainly that after the consecration, and before the receiuing, the man-

manner was that the Priest fell on his knees. For else would not Rabanus have said, *pro more pro cunibebat.*

These witnesses may (I thinke) serue to assure vs, that at that time, when the *Reall presence* was come into dispute; and after that, till the way of *Transubstantiation* was defined, They did vse to communicate with *Adoration*. And yet it cannot bee shewed that any Bishop of *Rome* did appoint it so to bee.

### C A P . X X I I .

*That in the most ancient times, before corruption of the doctrine of the Sacrament began, the Sacra-  
ment was received with adoring  
Gesture.*

**N**ow, for the more ancient times, in which the doctrine of the Sacrament was the same which ours now is, (as *Orthodoxus Consensus* most largely, and *Duplessis de Misa* and others doe manifest:) I say with that learned Treatise *Dialogicon Eucharisticum* confidently, that the Fathers did receive the Sacrament Adoring; Adoring, not the Sacrament but Christ; and to shew this, I will begin as high as I can, and come downe-wards.

\* Cap. 14.

*Tertullian de oratione*, \* after Reprooche of other abuses about prayer, cometh at length to say, *Similiter de statuorum diebus, non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interuenientendus, quod statio solmenda sit accepio corpore Domini. Ergo, denotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resoluta, an magis Deo obligat? nonne solennior erit statio tua, si & ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini & reservato virumque saluum est, & participatio sacrificij & executio officij. Si statio de militari ex-emplo nomen accipit (nam & militia dei sumus) utique nulla latet, sine (not as it is printed, sine) tristitia obtutens castris stationes missum rescindit. Nam latitia libenter, tristitia sollicitus administrat disciplinam.* Likewise on the dayes of *Sermon* most men think they should not be present, at the pray-

ers

ers of the Sacrifice, because the body of our Lord being taken, the Station is to be dissolved. Doth then the Eucharist dissolve the obseruance devoted to God, or rather more oblige unto God? Shall not thy station bee more solemne, if thou shalt stand even at the Altar of God? The body of our Lord being taken and reterued, each is safe, both the participation of the Sacrifice, and the performance of that obseruance (viz. of standing in prayer.) If station take the name from the patterne of Souldiers (for wee are Gods souldiery,) verily neither joy or sorrow happening to the campe, dissolues the stations of Souldiers, for joy obserues discipline more cheerefully, sorrow more carefully.

The place is darke, and must bee opened, before wee can make vse of that Testimony, wherefore first we must know, what the dayes of station doe meane. \* Some take them to be their set dayes of Fasting. But that cannot be. For Tertullian himselfe doth difference them one from another, lib. 2. c. 4. ad uxorem, where showing the mischiefe and hindrances which a woman shall haue by taking an Infidell to bee her husband (as some then did in their second mariages) he saith, *Ut si statio facienda sit, Maritus de die conduceat ad Balneas: Si ieiunia obseruanda sunt, Maritus eadem die conuinimus exercet,* &c. Where *Ieiunia* is not put as an explication of *Statio*, as if they signified one and the same thing: nor is *statio* put for the *Vigils* in the times of their fastings, as *de la Cerda* on that place, and *Bell. lib. 2. de bon. operib. cap. 22.* would haue it: for those *Vigils* (as the same *Cerda* and *Bellarmino* there confess) were only *de nocte* of the night, not of the day; wheras Tertullian speakes xpresly of station as an act proper to the day time, saying: if a station be to be performed, the husband may that same day leade her to the Bathes: if fastings be to be observed, the husband may the same day hold a feast. That Glosse therefore of the *Ieiuites* is but a dreame. It remaines then, that *Station* is vsed in a proper not figurative sense, to note some solemne act performed in the day time: and that *Statio* and *Ieiunia* are put for different things and the *station* is letted by carrying her that day to the *Bathes*, *Fasts*, by her husbands appointing of a *Feast* that day. Besides fasting could not bee abso-

*De la Cerda,*  
the chuite vp-  
on this place,  
num. 143. and  
151. 152.

*Bell. lib. 2. de  
bon. operib. cap.  
22. alij 91.*

absolutely hindred by going to the *Basses*: nor *Vigils* at all, by holding a fast in the day, if the *Vigils* were held only in the nights. *Stationes*, therefore were those dayes wherein (by a Tradition universally received) they stood in prayer, and at all the solemn worship of God: of which *Tertullian* saith, *Dicibus dominicis ieiunare nefas ducimus, vel degeneris adorare, wec hold it an heynous thing to fast on the Lords dayes; or, to aurore on our knees: Eadem immunitatis a die Pasche ad Pentecostem usque gaudemus.* This immunity wee enjoy from Easter vntill Pentecost. This Ceremony of standing on those dayes, and of not fasting on those dayes, serued to expresse their beleefe and joyfull remembrance of our Lords Resurrection from the dead. This is that which *Tertullian* calleth, *denuum Deo obsequium*, a devout dutie (or service) vnto God. And that *Tertullian*, in this place, by *Station*, where hee saith, *quod statio soluenda sit*; meaneþ the very posture or gesture of standing, in the place alledged; appeareth yet further in the words themselves, when hee saith, *Nonne statio tua solennior erit, si & ad aram Dei steteris? shall not thy station bee the more solemne; if thou stand at the Altar?*

The *Communion-table* then is, after the phrase of that time, called the Altar. The *Sacraments* of Christ's body and blood, the *Sacrifices*. The *prayers* used in that action, about the blessing or consecration of Bread and Wine to that use, the *prayers of the Sacrifices*. All which, by the word [*Enchiristia*] there used, as it were expositiuely, are manifest. Wherefore there can bee no other meaning of *Tertullians* words alledged, but this: That on those dayes on which the solemn worship of God, was (by a Tradition called *Apostolical*) performed *Standing* and not *kneeling*; Many men, or most men [*plorique*] withdrew themselves, when they came to the celebration of the *Supper*, because the body of our Lord, that is, the *Sacramental bread*, being taken of the Ministers hand, *The station, i.e. standing must bee dissolved, or left.* And because standing on those dayes might not be left (as they thought) therefore they rather left the *Sacrament* on those dayes, then they would breake the rule of standing

*Tertull. de Co-*  
*ron. Mil. cap.*  
*3. Edit. Paris.*  
*Anno. 1624.*

on those dayes. Therefore they forbore : which can haue no reason but this, that taking the holy things at the Table standing; yet they vsed not to partake them, [i.e. eat the bread or drinke the wine] in any other gesture, then what was on the stacion dayes then forbidden, *Kneeling*.

And it is to bee marked that hee doth not say, *accepto cor-* A. 200.  
*pore Domini statio solvitur*; but *solvenda sit*, i.e. when, after  
the taking of it (<sup>a</sup> as was then the manner) of the Ministers a *Tertul. de er-*  
hands, they came to receive it into their bodies. *ronas Milis. c. 3.*

If the gesture then vsed, had beeene *standing*, this scrupule could not haue come into their minds : no, nor if it had beeene *sitting*, for that, was not forbidden in all the solemne service of God on those dayes, but vsed, as appeareth in *Justin Martyr*, in hearing the word of God read and preached. Oaely *kneeling* was then restrayned, and that (say some) not onely in prayer, but in all the divine service ; *Tertullian* saith not, *de geniculis orate*, pray kneeling, but *Adore*, as *Altare Damascenum* obserues : The people therefore, not daring to *kneele*, on those standing dayes, and not liking to receive the mysteries in any other gesture, then that of *Kneeling*, whereby they might the better shew their discerning of the Lords body, in the most humble gesture when they partaked the mysteries ; chose on those dayes, on which they might not *Kneele*, to forbear the Sacrament, and to take it on other dayes, when they might *kneele* in receiving it. *In Tertull.*  
*adoreare is Orare*  
*re lib. de Orati-  
one : and the*  
*I. Councell of*  
*Nice restrains*  
*it onely to*  
*prayer. Casus*  
*20. annus Bini*  
*Edit. 1618.*

That it was thus, the Remedies which *Tertullian* propoundeth, doe make yet more cleare. For hee, to perswade them not to absent themselves from the Sacrifice-prayers made at the *Altar* (i.e. the *Communion-table*) because of that ; First telleth them, that their *standing* shall not bee taken away, but made *solennior*, more remardeable, if they shal stand at the Altar, & therfore they might come to those prayers as well as to others, and stand in them at the *Altar*, yea, and take the *Lords body*, i.e. as hee <sup>b</sup> elsewhere expouneth himselfe, the *figure of his body*, the bread ; and not, *assu-* *Tertullian*  
*versus Marci.*  
*lib. 1. cap. 40.*  
*mere*, not eat it at that time, but referue it and carry it away with them, and eat it at *home* in private, where they might

receive it *Kneeling*, which in the publicke assembly they might not then doe, in the Station dayes. This hee saith, *ac-  
cupo iugum corpore Domini & reservato, utrumque salutem est,  
& participatio sacrificij & executio officij.* both are by this deuise provided for, both the partaking of the Sacrifice, i.e. the Sacrament of Christ's sacrifice; and the performance of that duty of *not kneeling* in the publicke worship of God, on those dayes of Station.

And that they might see hee had no meaning to dissolve the station, or standing, he addeth, that if the name bee taken from *Military fashion*, (as wee are Christ's Souldiers) then the standing must bee obserued, because Souldiers never lefft their stations, for any joy of good, or sorrow of ill successe: but still they kept their station, more chearefully if things went well, and more caretully, if ill. *Nam latitia libensius, tristitia  
solicitus administrabit disciplinam.*

In summe, the people would not come to take the Sacrament, when they might *not kneele* in the Act of receiving or partaking it, and therefore forbore to come vnto the Communion-Table, and prayer on those Station dayes. Terullian wishes them to come, though they might not then kneele, and to take the Bread in publike standing at the Table, and refreue and carry it away with them, and receive it at their owne houses, as they desired, *kneeling*. Thus should the Eucharist bee received, and the tradition of standing on those dayes in the publicke worship of God, be also obserued.

I allow not the deuise, but onely relate it: and out of it, doe (in my conscience) obserue, that the Christians then did, and before had vsed, *assumere adorantes*, to take it adoring, in reverence, not to the *visible signes*, but the *internall grace*.

And this agreeth well with that advise of Origen, given to every man, that when the Lord commeth to him in the Sacrament, *bree, bumbling himselfe should say as did the Centurion, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter into my maner*: which words haue, (if not since that time, as Duran affirmes, yet) for many ages, been vsed by the Communicants immediatly before the receiving; or some other such

Anno 230.  
Origen Hom.  
in Deversos.  
Vide Enseb. E-  
missus Hom. in  
2. Domin. post.  
Epiphani. al-  
leaged in the  
Troll of knee-  
ling, p. 195. by  
Rochester.

such like prayer, to which the Communicant said, *Amen.*

Now, that from that time of *Tertullian*, it was a common fashion to take (i.e. *accipere*) the holy mysteries in the publick assemblies on the Lords dayes and Pentecost, and to carry them away, and vse them privately in their owne houses, or elsewhere euery day, *ante omnem cibum*, fasting, as *Tertullian* speaketh; or when they would, is manifest (if, any thing) in *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Hierome*, and others. And, that they did in private, receive the same kneeling, or *prostrato*, and that with the approbation of the then Paltors, appeareth in the example of *Gorgonia*, and the applause of that famous Bishop who reporteth it, *Greg. Nazian.* who telleth, how for recovery from her sicknes and paine, after all other helpe in vaine vsed, shee went to the Church and Altar in the night, and there prostrate with faith before the Altar, &c. And having layd her head to the Altar, with like (that is, as is before expressed, with a great) crie and teares wherewith shee abounded, (like to that woman who of olde washed the feet of Christ) and professed that shee wold not part thence, till shee had obtainedcure, and afterwards had with this her medicine, (that is, of her teares, as *Elias Cretensis* expounds it) rinsed her whole body, and that if her hand had any where bid (or layd up, *ēntraveris*) any part *ārtūtōv*, of the signes of (Christ's) precious body and blood, shee had mingled it with her teares (O admirable thing!) shee presently felte her selfe cured of her disease, &c. Which place I vrge not, conceauing that at that time shee did receive those holy mysteries from the hand of any Minister then administering the same vnto her, it being in the night season when shee is said thus to haue done; but that shee (in case shee had any where reserved any part of the mysteries formerly administered to her, and intended now privately to haue eaten and drunke the same in the night) could not but haue mingled them with her teares: and thence to shew, (as *Billius* also notes vpon the place) the ancient custome of those times to haue been this: viz. to reserve the Sacrament, and to eat it privately, as (saith the same *Billius*) *Tertull. lib. 2. ad uxorem* testifieth. For, would *Greg. Nazianzen* haue supposed her to haue layd vp any of those

*Tertul. ad ux-*  
*erom.*  
*Cyprian.*  
*Hieronim.*

*Anno 380.*  
*Greg. Nazian.*  
*Orat. in Laudib.*  
*Gergonia. Edis.*  
*Paris. 1609.*

signes of Christ's body and blood, to haue made vse of them at such a time when there was privately prostrate, and praying with teares at the Altar, if such a thing had not then been in vse?

This reservation might possibly bee begun before, by reason of persecution; or, for that reason the rather continued. But I conceiuie, the either first or most prevailing occasion was this, that on the Lord's dayes they might not receive it kneeling, and their deuotion & ignorance together was such, that they held it not fit *assumere*, to take it, but kneeling or prostrate; not adoring that which was *seen*, as *Augustine* saith; and therefore not the *Bread* or *species* of *Bread*, but that which was *not seen*.

This abuse of Reservation was after marked in the church, and thereupon all men condemned as accursed, who should *accipere*, and not *sumere*, take it in the Church, but not at all partake it. 1. Councell of Toledo. And, by the Casar Augustan Councell, all men denounced accursed, that should take it, and not receive (*assumere*) it (in Ecclesia) in their Church or place of their holy meetings.

The ancient Rite of *not kneeling* in their solemne or publicke prayers or worship on the Lord's dayes, or betwixt Easter and Whitsuntide, still continued, often renewed by sundry Synods, and was in a manner vnniuerally obserued. The people therefore that might not still carry the holy things out of the Church as they had vsed, but must partake them there, were permitted, rather then appoynted to *kneele*, when they did *sumere*, and vse some priuate prayers: onely at the publike prayers they stood. And the Ministers, though on those dayes they might not *kneele* at the *consecration Prayers*, (I mean about the *Sacrament*) yet they performed them inclinatis, bowing their faces towards the ground. And the common people after they had taken the sacred things at the Altar or Communion Table, or otherwise, standing, betooke themselves to their priuate deuotions, first on their *knees*, and so received the *Sacrament* *kneeling* in their owne places, till that afterwards it was carried to them where they were; as, in the Church of *Rome* was the manner, at leaft, *anno. 800.*  
See *Ordo Rom.*

That

That this is true, appeareth in *Sozomens Historie* of that *Sozomen. Hist.*  
 woman, who being tainted with the error of *Macedonius*, *lib. 8. cap. 5.*  
 yet to give her husband content, (who threatened to leaue  
 her if she would not receive the Sacrament in *Chrysostomes*,  
 who liued,  
*A.D. 430.*  
 the orthodox Church) went thither, hauing prouided her  
 selfe of some other bread from home; This woman there-  
 fore taketh the sacramentall Bread of the Pastors hand, and  
 then kneeling downe as if it had been to prayer (saith *Sozomen*)  
 conveyed that away, and put her own bread into her mouth,  
 which, when shee would haue chewed, was turned into a  
 stone: By astonishment whereof, shee discouered to *Chry-  
 softome* all the matter. Let him that will and dare, censure  
 the matter; namely, that there was no such miracle done;  
 yet, that *Sozomen* hath so related it, no man can denie. And  
 thence must needs appeare, that the manner of Communi-  
 cants was so to doe, seeing shee that desired to bee thought  
 to Communicate, did so no doubt, as others vied to doe,  
 outwardly, in Communicating. And this agreeth with *Chry-  
 softome* words, *Adora & Communica*, Adore and Com-  
 municate. Nor can this of *Chrysostome* bee put off, by the  
 ambiguous and different meaning of the word *Adore*, as if  
 it might (perhaps) onely meane internall adoration, which all  
 men confess to be necessary in that action. For, *Chrysostome*  
 sheweth of what kinde of Adoration bee speakest vñually  
 in this matter, namely, of *Externa*.

For in his seuenth Homily on *Matthew*, he exhorteth (by *A.D. 400.*)  
 the example of the *Magi*, or Wise men which came out of  
 their owne countrey) to *Adore*, i. e. externally to come to  
 the house of Bread. — But, to adore and honour the Sonne of  
 God: warneth men, that they counterfet not as Herod, who  
 said bee would come to adore, but meant to kill: and saith, that  
 such like are they which haing Mammon in their hearts, doe a-  
 buse unworthily the Communion of the mystery: — who seeme to  
 adore, but as much as in them is, kill him whom they feigne them-  
 selues to adore. — He concludeth, \* *Timpemus igitur, Let vs*  
 feare therefore, lest when wee carry the shew of suppliants and a-  
 dorers, we be indeed enemies. *Let vs then when wee are about to*  
 adore, cast all things from vs, &c. In which passage, he plaine-

ly requireth so the outward adoration, as it should not bee separated from the inward; and shewes, that adoration, which even Hypocrites might performe, must needs bee onely external, and in the fashion (as he saith) of *Suppliants*.

The same *Crysost.* *Hom. 24.* in *1. Cen. 10.* exhorting (as he doth in his seventh *Hom. on Matb.*) by the example of the *Magi*, to come humbly to worship Christ, pleadeth that they haue more reason to honour his *Body* which is set before them on the Altar. *For, that which is worthy of highest honour (saith he) I will shew thee on earth.* *For, as in the Court of Kings, nor the walls, nor the golden roofs, but the Body of the King sitting in his throne is the chiefeſt of all:* *So, in the heauens is that kingly body, which now on earth is set before thee to bee ſene,* &c. In which paſſage it is plaine, that hee calleth for ſuch Adoration, as the *Magi*, performed to Christ lying in the eratch; not, because hee thought the very naturall body of Christ to bee locally there vpon the *Altar*, which hee, euē there, affirmeſ to bee enthronized in the highest Heauens: But because the *Bread* is the very body of Christ in a mystery onely; for he could not else ſay, *It is to bee ſene on the Altar-table.* Nor was this Adoration which he calleth for, intended terminarie, to determine in the Sacramentall bread, or the ſpecies which appeared; or, in Christ as contained therein; but onely before the ſame, and by occation thereof vnto Christ himſelfe ſitting in glory, as M. Perkins well ſaith. *For, as Augustine ſaith, He that adores but a profitable ſigne which God hath commanded, (marke well, that this makes no roome for Images which God hath not commanded), and understandeth the ſignification, doth not adore that which is ſene, and periſheth, but rather that vnto which all ſuch things are to be referred, of which hee after giueth instance in Baptisme, and the Lords Supper.* This will not hold in Images, nor profit them who adore Christ as contained, and exiſtent in the place, where had beeſe the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, (as they ſay) indeed, is ſtill; \* any more then for adoration of water in Baptisme. The *Sacraments* (ſaith Bishop Jewel) in that

*Perk. Works  
Anno. 1609. Vol.  
2. p. 642.  
Aug. de Doctr.  
Chrif. l. 3. c. 9.*

The baptized that were of yeres did adore (whē they were baptiz'd) not Baptisme, but Christ. \* *Jewel. Artic.* *8. Defence pa. ſort, i. e. in respect of that which they ſignifie, and not in respect of 409. Edit. prim. that which they are in themselves, are the flesh of Christ and are*

so understood, and believed, and adored ; but the whole honour resteth not in them , but is passed over from them to the things which be signified.

His meaning is , that no more is, or may be done, respectively to the Sacrament, then that which we call *Veneration* ; that, which in strict sense, wee call *Adoration* or *divine Worship*, is referred to God; of which two, the difference(as I haue shewed) cannot alwayes, nor needeth to be shewed, in, or by the outward gesture, but is onely in the distinction, and intention of the minde. *The people worshipped* (saith the Text) *God and the King*. Where the outward adoration was one , as the word by which it is expressed, is but one ; but the *Religious* and *Civill*, were distinct in the minde, intention and reason of either.

Weil saith Doctor Ames, That *veneration* or *reverence* is due to the Sacrament it selfe as Gods Ordinance, And that Christ <sup>tibell. Tom.3.</sup> is to be adored in the use of it, though not as inclosed in the Bread <sup>diff. 37. art. 25.</sup> and Wine, or existent in the place of their substance. This digression is to cleare Chrysostomes, and the other Ancient Fathers meanings. Now, returne we to the History.

### C A P. 23.

*The same shewed to bee the practise of the Church,  
in the time of Theodoret, Saint Augu-  
stine, and Cyril.*

**T**heodores, *Dial. 2.* hath this passage : *Neque enim, &c.* Ann. 430. <sup>ad</sup> For neither after the Consecration doe these mysticall signes depart from their proper nature, for they remaine in their former substance, figure, and kind or species, and therefore are they both seene and felt as before. And yet are they understood to bee that which they are made , and are believned and adored, as being the very things which they are believned to bee. This testimony sheweth plainly, that Theodores believued neither *Transubstantiation*, nor *Consubstantiation*. Not *Transubstantiation*, for he denieth any change to be made by *Consecration*, either in the substance, forme or species : nor *Consubstantiation*, for he saith not, that in , or with those mysticall signes is that

which is *believed* and *adored*; but that the signes themselves are understood to bee that which is *believed* and *adored*, id est, to be that in a *Myste*, i.e.: For else how said our Lord, *This is my body?* How Paul, *The rocke was Christ?* And yet Theodoret plainly sheweth, that there; not, *Elements*, but *signes*, i. e. *Sacraments of Bread and Wine sanctified by the Will of Christ* to that vise, are *believed* and *adored*, not meaning, that the adoration should at all rest in the visible things, in which no reall change was made, but was referred to what they are, in their signification and use, the *body and blood of Christ*, inseparably knit to the person of the Sonne of God, or Deitie in that Person.

Lyr. adversus  
Indium.  
Deleicticon  
Euchar.

Ang. de Cate-  
chisandis ru-  
dibus. cap. 3.

Thus was God worshipped in the *Bush*, as *Lyra* saith; and in the *Arke*, as that learned man, forenamed; and it appeareth, *Psal. 95. 6.* to bee so. Thus *Danids* dauncing before the *Arke*, was, before the *Lord*, *2. Sam. 6.*

The signes (saith *Augustine*) are *visible things*, but *invisible things* are adored in them. He saith, that *invisible things* which are in them are adored, not as if hee had once dreamed of *Christs* being (*ibi*) there contained in, or under the species (for he often professeth, that *Christs* naturall body, where it is, is *visible*, and occupieth a place, or else could not be a body; and is now, and shall be onely in heaven, till he come to Iudgement) but that the *Adoration* is intended not at all to the *Signes* themselves, as they are *visible things*; but to *Christ* himselfe, which is not seene; who is in the *Signes* onely, *ut signatum in signo*, by vertue of a *Sacramentall Relation*, not by any *Locall inexistence*.

The same *Theodore*, in *Dialog. 3.* reasoneth from the *Adoration* done outwardly to the *Sacrament* (though in Relation to *Christ*) thereby to proue that the flesh of *Christ* it selfe, being the flesh of the Sonne of God, is to bee *Adored*, saying; *How is the Archetype it selfe base or contemptible, whose type is to be Adored and reverenced?* Where, first it is manifest that hee esteemeth and calleth the *Sacrament* but a *type* of the *body and blood of Christ*, which is the *Archetype*, and therefore fauoureth not any *reall Carnall* pretence, but excludeth that: And yet, seeing, from the *Adoration* done to the

the type in reference to Christ the Archtype, hee so dispu-  
teth ; hee plainly sheweth, that it was vnuall and knowne  
to all men then, that such *externall Adoration or veneration*,  
was performed in the celebration of the mysteries vnto  
them as types, to bee passed ouer (as *Jewell speaketh*) to the  
*Archtype*, and not to rest in them. And hee that will inter-  
pret this Adoration to haue beene onely *internall or mentall*,  
must conclude, that to the very person of Christ, no *externall*  
Adoration must bee giuen. For how else will *Theodoret's*  
Argument stand good ?

That this was not alone in some places; or in the Eallerne  
Churches, but in many or all ; and in the West also take we  
the Testimonies of Saint *Ambrose* and S. *Augustine*. They  
both, led with the *Latino Translation*, *Psal. 94. 6.* *Adora-*  
*te scabellum eius*, in stead of *ad scabellum*; reading [*Worship his*  
*foot-stoole*] for [*Worship at his foot-stoe*] are troubled to  
thinke how that speech could bee right, when it was not  
lawfull to Adore any creature. And thinke you, these meane  
to Adore the *consecrated Elements* as if they were no crea-  
tures? verely no, for *Ambrose* saith, that *they remaine the*  
*same that they were, and yet are turned to another thing*: that is,  
in *use*, and *mysterie* an other thing; but in their substance,  
still the same creatures. Vpon this, *Ambrose* first, and *Aug.*  
after him; and many others, after them, enquire what that  
same *foot-stoole* (in the *Psalme*) may bee, which men must *Ad-*  
*dore*. They find in *Isay 61*. That the *earth* is called the *Lords*  
*foot-stoole*. Well, then men must worship the *earth*. But this  
they also abhorre, lest they should offend him that is *Lord*  
of heauen and earth. They then remember, that *Christ's hu-*  
*mane body was earth of the earth*, and that the same, as taken  
into the *vniety* of the person of the Sonne of God, was to be  
*Adored* for the *Deities sake*, to which it is inseperably *vni-*  
*ted*. Here is the ground. But then, how shall wee Adore that  
flesh which is not present with vs? Hence *Augustine*: And  
because he hath walked in that flesh, and hath giuen vs that flesh  
to bee eaten vnto *Saluation*, and no man eateth that flesh unlesse  
he hath first adored it. It is found how such a *foot-stoole* of the  
*Lord* is adored, and we not only shall not sinne in *Adoring* it, but

shall

shall sinne in not Adoring. But doth the flesh quicken or give life? Our Lord himselfe hath sold, commanding (to vs) the same earth. It is the spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing. And, Ideo & ad terram quamlibet cum tu inclinas & prosternis, non quasi terram intuearis, therefore when thou bowest or prostratest thy selfe to any earth, thou oughtest to behold it, not as earth, but look: at that Holy one, whose footstoole that is which thou dost adore, for thou adorest for his sake; wherefore hee hath added here, *Quia sanctum est.*, &c. In this large passage of Saint Augustine, it is manifest that his devise is, to forefend all Adoration of any meere creature, and to acknowledge the humanity of Christ only, though a creature, to bee capable of divine Adoration, in respect of the Deity to which it is personally united. Therefore Augustine was no Papist, nor will his Testimony at all serue their turne, which worship any thing, that is not also God, as the *Man Christ* is.

*Beza* therfore saith, that in Aug. time they did receive, *adorantes*: hee means *kneeling, adversus*

*Hesbusii p.311*  
*b Reply to Bishop Morton, part. 2. cap. 22. to the testimonies of Aug. and Chrysost.*  
*Beza* saith it ought to bee received both with *internall* and *externall* *Adoration.*

*Quest. & Resp. lib. Quest. 243.*

But withall, the Text of *August.* doth manifestly shew, that Christ God and Man was adored of every Communicant; before hee received the Sacramentall flesh of Christ in the Eucharist: And that this was, in *Augustines* iudgement, so farre from being a sinne, that it was a sinne not to doe it

*b* *Reply to Bishop Morton, part. 2. cap. 22. to the testimonies of Aug. and Chrysost.*  
But to this is <sup>b</sup> answered, that every true Communicant must adore Christ before he partake him in the Sacraments, but that is internally by faith and loue, &c. This is true I confess; but is so far from excluding the outward expression by some bodily signe of Godly reverence, that it rather doth require it, that God may be worshipped in body and soule together.

But this must not bee pleaded, to void the Testimony of Aug. alleged to prove *externall* Adoration before communicating. For first, the Text of the Psalme speaketh of bodily worship, and therefore must bodily worship bee in *Augustines* eye, when hee would shew to what, or rather whom that worship, which the Psalme requireth, may bee tended. Secondly, when hee saith, *Et ad terram quamlibet te inclinas & prosternas, to whatsoever earth, i.e. flesh of Christ thou bowest and prostratest thy selfe, looke not on it as earth,*

i.e. as

i.e. as flesh, but looke at that holy one whose foot-stool it is that thou dost adore, i.e. Looke to the God-head of Christ whose flesh thou dost Adore in the mysteries. It cannot therefore bee denied with a good conscience, that *Augustine* speaketh of outward Adoration performed by the bowing or prostrating of the body before the mysteries; not, to them determinatively, but in Relation to Christ himselfe, and that for his Deities sake. Which is also the same that *Ambrose* speake-  
Ambr. de S. Sav.  
B. lib. 5. c. 12.

keth of the flesh of Christ saying (which we adores in these mysteries) referring the Adoration not to the mysteries or signes, but to Christ which is represented to vs, and Sacra-  
 mentally exhibited by them. One thing more I would haue  
 to bee marked in *Augustines* words, that hee reckoneth Inclination of the body, as well as Prostration on the knee, to  
 bee externall Adoration, as all men vse to doe; contrary to  
 the new learning of *Altare Damascenum* which will haue  
 kneeling a proper gesture of Adoration, not other bowings  
 (such as wee vse in signe of reuerence to men;) contrary to  
 Scripture and Common-sense.

And this of *Augustine* agreeth with *Chrysostome*, who *Chrysost. Hom.*  
 speaking of the adoration of Christ in the mysteries saith, that  
 therefore the Deacon cryeth not, inclinate capita, bow your  
 heads (which, in the Liturgy bearing his name, wee find,  
 inclinate capita Deo, bow your heads vnto God) after the  
 consecration; not to God, as there contained, but represented.  
3. de incompre-  
hensibili na-  
tura Dei.

To the Testimony of *Augustine* I adde this, that the Christians in his time were taxed by the Heathens for Wor-  
 shipping *Ceres* and *Bacchus*. From whence is manifest that something was then done, which gaue them colour of that calumnyation: For the times were not now, with Christians, as formerly, when the Heathens durst seigne any thing against Christ; as whom the Imperiall power did persecute. And to put the matter out of daunger, *Augustine* sheweth, that it was their manner, or Rite of receiuing the bread and wine of the Lords Supper. *A Cerere & Libero djs Pagano-  
 rum longe absimus, quamuis panis & calicis Sacramentum  
 nostro ritu amplectamur, ita patres nostri longe fuerunt a Satyr- 20. cap. 13.  
 viacis catenis, quamuis pro tempore prophetie Sabbathi vacatio-  
 nem*

*Aug. contra  
 Faustum Ma-  
 ricanum lib.*

*nem obseruauerunt: Wee differ wide from Ceres and Bacchus those Pagan Idols, although wee imbrace that Rite in receiving the Sacrament of the Bread and Cup. So our Ancestors were farre from the chaines of the Saturnian heresie, although for the time of prophecie, they obserued the rest of the Sabbath: whereby it is plaine, that like as the Iewes obseruation of their Sabbath called Saturnes day, was the occasion that moued the Gentiles, yea and Manichees, to say that the Iewes Worshipped Saturne; So the Ritus, the manner or fashion of the Christians receiving the Sacrament of Bread and Wine, occasioned the malicious Gentiles to say, that they adored Ceres and Bacchus, as their owne Gods.*

*Fulkes Answer  
to the Rhemists  
on 1 Cor. 11.*

*\* Cicero de na-  
tura Deorum,  
who is such a  
foole as to be-  
lieue that very  
thing which  
he eateth, to  
be God.*

*Alt. Damasc.*

*August.*

It is true, I confesse, which Doctor Fulke saith, that the Pagans did neuer worship Bread and Wine: and it is as true that they did not challenge the Christians for worshipping Bread and Wine. For the very \* Heathens counted it a madnesse in any man *to worship that as God which hee did eat.* This madnesse came into the world, with *Transubstantiation.* Wherefore the Pagans did conceiue, the Adoration used in receiving the Bread and Wine of the Lords Supper to bee intended and done to *Ceres and Bacchus* their owne imaginary Gods, Gods (as they thought) of Bread and Wine: like as they tooke the obseruation of *Saturne-day* the Iewes Sabbath, to bee held in honour of *Saturne* their Idoll; as saith *Augustine*, the *Manichees* also did. And therefore this is a pregnant evidence, not for the Papists, that the Sacrament was it selfe adored, *as being made a God*, but onely for this, that they did then, *Panis & vini Sacra menta suo ritu amplecti;* receive the Sacrament in that fashion and rite ~~that the Gentiles used~~; which *Ritus* was, *externall Adoration*, referring it unto Christ by them. The *Altare Damascenum* would not haue vs thinke, that the Heathens had any more colour of occasion, then *onely a solemne reverent usage of Bread and Wine.* But this is but a shift, when *Augustine* himselfe hath told vs, that no man did communicate, but hee first adored. And wee haue, out of his words, learned how.

I will adde one Testimony more out of the *Mystagogick catechisme of Cyril*, either of *Jerusalem*, in whose name it com-

commonly goeth, who liued *An. 370.* or *Iohn of Ierusalem*, vnder whose name, Master *Robert Cooke* saith, it was *Cooke in Gen-*  
*marted, &c.* and whote, that learned *Duplefis* taketh it ra-  
*ther to bee, (as I for my parte doe not) who liued neare *An.** *Du'plefis re-*  
*600.* In this booke, *Catchis. 5.* This Author after he hath *sponse a Le-*  
*shewed in what manner the Bread should bee taken, saith,* *nesq; de Eu-*  
*Then come to the Cupp of the blood, not stretching out thy hand,* *roux, p. 422.* *via Causabon.*  
*Sed pronns & in modum Adorationis & venerationis, dicens,*  
*but bowing downe, and after the manner of Adoration or*  
*veneration, laying Amen. Where it cannot bee denied that,*  
*some prayer was vsed at the delivery, to which the Commu-*  
*nificant said, Amen, which wee find currantly to haue beeene*  
*in vse long before, viz. *An. 251.* namely, when *Noratianus Ann. 231.**  
*the intruding Bishop of Rome, in administering the Sacra-*  
*ment to the people, <sup>a</sup> tooke every mans hand betwixt his owne; a *Ensay. Hist.**  
*adjuiring him that hee should not returne to Cornelius (the Bp.* *lib. 5. cap. 42.*  
*(by right) then of Rome) and suffered no man to taste of the*  
*mysteries, till (in stead of that, he shoulde haue said, Amen.) hee*  
*said, I will not returne to Cornelius. Secondly, we marke,*  
*in *Cyrill*, that the Cup was receiued by each Communicant*  
*with *Adoration*.*

## C A P. 24.

*A Vindication of Doctor Morton, that Reverend Bishop*  
*of Coventric and Litchfeild, quarrelled by a*  
*namelesse Replier falsely charging Doctor*  
*Morton with abusing of Cyril, Au-*  
*gustine and Chrysostome in*  
*this point.*

**V**EE are come to about the 600. yeare. Now be- *Reply 2. part.*  
*fore I goe any further, I will take into considera-* *cap. 3. sect. 25.*  
*tion the Replier, made against some of those Testimonies,* *pag. 52. & 53.*  
*in a late intemperate and scoffing Libell, called a Reply to*  
*Doctor Mortons defence, &c. part. 2. cap. 3. Sect. 21. setting*  
*downe his words.*

The learned Bishop of Chester, to proue that, the Sacra-  
*ment*

ment was received with some adoration, by bowing of the body, before the time of Honorius, hath alledged Cyril, Augustine and Chrysostome. Let vs heare the Repliers Answer.

Repl. 1. I answer that the Question is here of Kneeling not of other gestures.

Answ. To which I reply, that the Question is, of Kneeling onely as a gesture of adoration; and therefore the proove of bowing for adoration, cometh home to the cause, though not to the word. And, it bowing to the Sacrament, bee not adoration, as well as kneeling, whi doth himselfe cite and allowe Bale, Duplessis, Lewell, Hospinian, and Zepper, affirming with one consent, that Honorius the third, was the Author of adoration of the Sacrament, who onely appointed the people reverent bowing of themselves to it, at the Elevation, &c. As is in this Section, alledged by himselfe.

Repl. 2. Answer. It is not now either enquired, what was voluntarilie either spoken, or practised by particular men, but what was enjoyned vnto Churches.

Answ. I resoyne. The Question is, whether the Sacrament was commonly received with adoration, before Transubstantiation was knownen, or thought off? This when wee proue by Records to haue beeene so; Is it not a meere shift, to tell vs, that they enquire for a Decree, not voluntarie practise onely? As for that hee addeth [of some few] it is a blinde. For, the Testimonies alledged shew the ordinary custome of the Christian Churches, then. And it nothing will serue for proove but a Decree, then can they not proue Kneeling of the people in the act of receiving, euer to haue beeene in the Church of Rome. For they themselues, namely Costerus, \* maintaineth it, not as a Decree, but as an ancient custome continued (saith hee) from the Apostles time.

Let vs haue our measure, and then will appeare, that either wee proue Kneeling; or, in stead of it, adoration by bowing, to haue beeene in the Primitive Church; though not, to the Sacrament it selfe; as, since: Or else, that they can not proue any Adoration, by kneeling in the act of receiving the Eucharist, no not in the Church of Rome. For neither of vs can shew a Decree, but onely a Custome. For, as for that which

\* Coster. Encycl. pag 353.  
Edit. 1550.

which is alleadged out of the Romane Rituall; that, to the Clergie-men, kneeling vpon the stayres of the Altar, the Eucharist should bee deluined, it doth not at all belong to the common people, who might not kneele there, at the Communion; and the kneeling in that case required, was respectu- See before in  
ly to the Altar, or things thereon, not to the Sacrament Cap. 10.  
as then received. That this kneeling respecteth the place, the Altar, Crucifix, or hoast thereon, and not the partaking of the Sacrament, may appeare by this, that the Priest himselfe is tyed by the Massie-booke, to receiue reverenter stans, reuently standing.

Repl. 3. Answer. These very places of Cyril, Augustine, and Chrysostome are vsually urged by Papists for their Idolatry: the Defendant therefore doth not well in borrowing their Weapons to fight against vs withall, for the Borrower is a seruants to the Lender. But the Ceremonies themselves being borrowed of the Papists, it is no marvell if our Prelates bee beholding to the Papists for proofes to maintaine them by.

Answ. To this I rejoyn. 1. That the same testimonies are alleadged by the Papists wrongfully to proue their Idolatry. For, that Adoration which the Fathers professedly referred to Christ as sitting in heauen, the Papists transferre to the Sacrament it selfe, as being, in the substance, nothing but Christ, and whole Christ. 2. The Defendant borrowed not those Testimonies from the Papists, (who were not the Owners but Abusers of them;) but of the Fathers themselves, to whom (it is not vncomely to say) we are debtors, and to God for them. 3. There is, by vs, nothing here said for maintenance of our Ceremonies, which wee suppose to bee maintainable so far, as not to be unlawfull by the Scriptures. The poynt herein hand, was onely matter of fact, viz. Whether the ancient Churches received the Communion adoring, yea, or no? The salt-biting of the Bishop, (as borrowing proofes from the Papists maintenance of Popish ceremonies,) maketh nothing to the Answer of the evidence produced; but turneth the Readers mind, by a brackish gybe, from off the cause, to the persons of the Bishops, which is not plaine dealing.

Repl. 4. Answ. As for Cyril, I Doctor Fulke saith of one precept

precept of Cyrills about the Sacrament, extant in the same page, out of which the Defendant citeth his, Verely I tooke it for a meere superstitious precept, may not this bee also superstitious which the Defendant citeth? Sure I am, that about the Sacraments, and about the Croffe and Chrisme, there is much superstition taught in the Catechismes which goe under the name of Cyril.

*Answ.* I reply, Something in Cyrill was superstitious, Ergo, this, is such an inference as the Replyer durst not affirme; and therefore onely asketh if it may not bee: which is answered with another [May it not bee no superstition?] But superstition, or not, is nothing (now) to the question, which onely is, Whether the thing was done or no? But this is the Replyers ordinary course, to let the cause alone, and fasten vpon something else; as if to say any thing after a man, were to answere him. But the Replyer hath more to say about Cyril.

Repl. 2. I say, Cyrill is corrupted, both by the Defendant, and by the Bishop of Rochester, p. 183. For 1. the Greeke word κυριων, Rochester translateth it, [falling on thy face,] ana the Defendant, [bowing of thy selfe] Whereas, though the word be many times used in such a sense, yet as Stephen (in his great Treasurie sheweth) it signifieth properly a gesture of the eyes, which appeareth plainly by the words compounded of it, ανακυριων, μετακυριων.

*Answ.* This Answer looks toward the matter. But what had the Replyer to doe with the Bishop of Rochester? Surely nothing, by the taske of his Reply to Bishop Morton, but that he had a desire to give him something of his good will. The Bishop of Rochester alleadgeth not the Greeke tex: of Cyril, which (perhaps) he saw not; but, the Latine translation of him, which is, Sed pronus & adorationis & veneracionis in modum, dicas Amen. If κυριων, be not well rendred, [pronus] in Latine, as it is; yet pronus may be turned (falling on the face) without corruption. For so Martial lib. 1. 88. *Et bibis immundam cum cane pronus aquam.*

At least it doth signifie a bending of the face downwards, as Robert Stephen obserues in his Latine Treasury, as contrary to

to supine. And this was enough to the Bishop of Rochester's turne; *Virorum cadavera supina fluitare feminarum prona.* Plin. l. 7. c. 17. But, the Bishop (then of Chester) turneth it, bowing thy selfe. What corruption is in that; vnlesse he should haue laid bowing thy selfe with thy face downwards, which he meant, and so did Christ: for this gesture is oppoled to stretching out of the hand. [not stretching out thy hand, ανα κομω, but bowing thy face downward,] and not (as the Replier) looking with the eyes downwards, which is no impediment to stretching out the hand, as bowing downward is. But the word (saith hee) is many times vsed in such a jense. He should haue said, mostly: But if it be many times so vsed, why is the Bishop taide to haue corrupted the Text? Forsooth, Robert Stephen saith, it signifieth properly a gesture of the eyes. Good, and doth not Rob. Stephen shew that it is frequently vsed for bowing downe of the face? And then, whether sensle is fitter. the place must shew not the word, mistake there might haue been, but not corruption. But it is utterly vntrue, that Robert Stephen doth say, that ωντω doth signific properly a gesture of the eyes, ωντω pronus sum, propendo, inclino me, vel inclino caput, sum capite obstipo, demitto oculos, saith Stephen. Where, casting downe of the eyes, is the last, and onely made a secondary sensle of the word, as following vpon the bowing downe of the head; and not the primary, and proper. Theretore the same Robert Stephen, in his Greek Concordance, rendreth it *incruo me*, and in his Treasury, *ωντω inclinatus, supplex.* But, the compound ανακυπω, and κατακυπω shew it? Cleane contrary. For, ανακυπω is *erigere se*, contrary to ωντω. So in John 8.89. where the words κατωνας and ανακυπω are both vsed: the one not for looking downe, but for bowing downe to write on the ground; the other, not for looking vp, but, lifting vp himselfe againe. As for κατακυπω, it doth signific bowing downe, to looke into; as in Ioan. 20. 11. So that the Replier hath falsified his Authour, to make good his challenge: and the Bishop of Chester hath not corrupted Cyril. But, he will giue vs a reason why, in this place at least, κομω should onely be [looking downe.]

Repl. And that Cyril respecteth the gesture of the eye, it is

very probable, because in receiving of the Bread, hee biddeth the Receiver first to sanctifie his eyes with it, and then to take it. In proportion whereof those words cited are used concerning the Cup, κυπεων, &c.

*Cham.de Canone lib.9.c.20. sect. 40.41.  
Damasc.Or. shodox. fidei, lib.4.cap.13.*

*Answe.* I answer. This probability is grounded vpon a mistaking of Cyrils words, which are not, that the Communicant shoule sanctifie his eyes, by looking on it; but, per contumeliam, by touching of it, as Chamier saith, & the place it selfe. So Damaso. saith also, That they shoulde put the mysticall Bread to their eyes, foreheads, and lips, &c. and then where is the Replyers ground? But he hath yet more to say.

*Repl.* And besides, Cyril doth manifestly referre the Adoration and worship hee speakest of, to the saying Amen. κυπεων, καὶ ἔπιστροφής καὶ στραμμάτου τὸ αὐτοῦ. i.e. Looking downe stedfastly vpon it, and saying Amen, in manner of Adoration and Veneration. What reason then had Rochester first, and Chester after, to apply the manner of worship and adoration unto the bodily gesture signified in the word κυπεων?

*Disputat. Altere Damasc.*

*2 Chron. 29.  
28.*

*Answe.* If the Adoration bee there referred to the prayer vsed at the delivery of the Cup, in the very act of receiving the same; Then was there Adoration vsed (and that by Order not voluntarily) in the act of receining, which is the point for which Cyril was alleadged. Let them, in receiving, referre their Adoration to Amen; that is, vnto the prayer vsed at the delivery, who will question them? But they rather condemne the use of any such particular prayer for each Communicant at that time; One, as a private worship in publicke; Another, as a mixing of severall worships; forgetting that euery Communicant performeth his private worship, when hee receiveth: And, that Bread and Broath, Creame and Strawberries, Wine and Sugar agree not better in our bodily meates, then some acts of worship with other some, though not all. The people adored, the Priests blaw with Trumpets, the Levites sang, and all this continued till the burnt offering was finished. Here is a mixture of priuate in publicke, and severall sortes of worship at the burnt offering.

2. The Replier hauing complained of two learned Bishops, that they had corrupted Cyril, in their translations, doth

doth himselfe indeed corrupt him, when he rendreth *xυμων* [looking downe steadfastly upon it] of which like sense of the word hee can giue no example, as if his griefe were not at mis-translation, but onely that any but himselfe should corrupt *Cyrill*.

3. The Adoration *προσκύνησις*, must needs bee referred to the *gesture*, for it denoteth the same, as all men know. And therefore the Bishops did right in referring it to the gesture required in the word *xυμων*, of which this is a declaration in what manner they should *xυμων*. The Replier is forced to put the words out of their owne order, to refferre the Adoration to *Amen*, though it gaine him nothing.

Repl. 3. Seeing *Cyrill* hath no precept of bowing the body at the receiving of the Bread, he cannot be so interpreted, concerning the Wine, without imputation of superstitions advancing of the Wine aboue the Bread.

Answ. I haue shewed before, that the manner was, when they had taken the Bread, to cary it to their owne places (I meane) in the Churches, where they went to the Table for it; and then, to receive it kneeling apart. And this was (as I thinke) the cause, why *Cyrill* requireth Adoration when they come to the Cup, which they might not cary away from the Table, as they did the other; and not so, for the Bread, because that custome had settled that, long before: viz. that men did sumere Adorantes.

Repl. 4. Seeing *Cyrill* had such leisure to appoint his Communicantes so many superstitions toies about the Sacraments, with particular description, as that hee should in taking the Bread, hold his fingers together, beare vp his right hand with his left, take it in the hollow of his hand so borne vp, taking great heed that no crume fall, &c. hee would surely more exprefly haue spoken of Kneeling, if it had beene used in his time.

Answ. This followes not: for that being (as wee haue shewed) so ingrafted in the peoples hearts, to receive the Bread into their mouthes, after some priuate prayers, Kneeling; There was no need to instruct them in that at all, and therefore *Cyrill* infisteth in the newer Inuentions about the Bread, in the manner of taking it at the Table.

Cyril's Testimony (wee see) hath put the Replier to many shifts, and will not bee shifted oft. As for his Answer to those alleadged out of Augustine and Chrysostome, viz. that they speake onely of Internall Adoration, though it haue some countenance from some men of excellent learning, yet it cannot stand with their expresse words, as I haue shewed before. Wherefore I may now goe on with some other witnesses of this point, That the Communion was received with outward Adoration before the Transubstantiation, or Real presence (as they call it) was knowne.

## C A P. 25.

*More Instances shewing the Antiquity of  
this gesture of Adoring or  
Kneeling.*

Ann. 530.  
*In Authentica  
de privilegiis  
dormitariis  
muliensibus non  
præstatatis.*

**A**bout the yeare of our Lord, 530. Justinian the Emperour made a Decree, that hereticall women shold haue no dowrie. In this, hee describeth such as shall bee held meet Judges of this matter (among other things, by this) that they doe in the Catholike Orthodox Church receiue *sacra-sanctam & Adorabilem communionem*, which very terme of *Adorable*, i.e. venerable, was, no doubt, giuen vnto it, because of their reverend esteeme, and manner of receiving it, with outward Adoration, not simply (as often is said) to it ; but, to Christ, in, and by his ordinance.

Ann. 580. as  
Coccius, but  
Poffevine sets  
him higher,  
at 340.  
*Bibl. Patrum*  
Tom. 5 part. 3.  
pa 887 & 888  
Anno 595.

**I**oannes Climacus grad. 23. thus, *Nam si mea sunt turpia illa & scelerata verba, quid est quod donum celeste suscipiens Adoro? quomodo possum una & benedicere, &c.* Which sheweth in mine apprehension, that the manner was to take the Communion adoring. Remigius Rhenensis (who lived in the end of the fifth Century, An. 589. as Baronius saith) in his Commentaries on 1. Cor. 11. 29. *Cam timore & tremore debemus accedere ad illud terrible Sacramentum, ut sciatis reverentiam se debere prestare ei, ad cuius corpus sumendum accedit.* Where, though wee haue not the name of adoration ; yet, the reason of it, that by the very comportment of the body in comming to that dreadfull Sacrament, the mind might vnder-

understand what is the internall reverence due to him that giueth his body, the Sonne of God: whether *Kneeling*, or *Bowing*, comes to one.

## C A P. 26.

*Instances of the practise of the Church about  
the eight hundred yeares af-  
scr Christ.*

I will adde no more, saue onely these obseruations, that how euer in thole dayes, the publicke prayers were generally performed on the *Lords-dayes*, and *Pentecost*, according to the twentieth Canon of 1. *Nicene councell*, standing and standing upright. Yet when they came to the *prayers a-* bout, or at the consecration, the Ceremony was, that the Ministers did pray, *inclinantes se*, or bowing downe-wards with their heads and faces; *Etenim quod prout Sacerdos mystagogiam faciat, id declarat eum cum solo Deo colloquis, unde & diuinam lucis apparitionem cernit, & ad splendorem con- spectus filij Dei, exultarescit, & se subtrahit timore & verecun- dia, quemadmodum Moses quum Deum vidit in monte, ignis specie, pericrefactus recessit & occultavit faciem suam, rever- batur enim percipere a gloria Dei faciens. For in that the Priest performes the mysteries bowing of himselfe, that shewes him to conuerse onely with God, whence hee sees a diuine apparition of light, and both cheeres vp himselfe at the splendor of the sightor Christ beholding him, and also withdrawes himselfe out of feare and modesty: Euen as Moses when hee saw God in the Mount, in the forme of fire, being afraid, retyred, and hid his face, because his mo- desty feared to looke vpon the glory of God face to face.*

In the Romane Church (as appeareth in the Booke set out first about or before the yeare 800. mentioned by <sup>a</sup> *A- malarus* who liued An. 830. called <sup>b</sup> *Ordo Romanus*) directi- on is giuen to the Bishop, when hee must *inclinare se*, bow himselfe downe in some part of the *Canon*, (as it was called) *of the Masse*, and when, the Deacons, and Subdeacons must *stare inclinati*, stand bowing themselues downe; when, *se*

*S. Germanus  
Arch Constat.  
Rerum Eccle-  
sasticarum  
theoria. Biblio-  
patrum. Colom.  
Tom. 8. pag. 61.  
column. 1. 1st. C.*

*a Amalar.de  
Officium Eccles.  
lib. 3. cap. 31.  
b Ordo Rom. in  
Bibl Patr. Co-  
lon. Tom. 8 pa.  
397 & 401.*

c Amalar. de  
Ordine Antiphonariss lib.  
cap. 52. in Bib.  
Pat. Colom.  
Tom 9. part. 1.  
pag. 411.

erigere, erect or raise themselves vpright. c Amalarius, de glorioſo officia quod fit in Romana Ecclesia in Paschais hebdomada (in which the Canon was, that they should pray ſtanding) mentioneth a prayer, *Quam ſolemus dicere genua flectendo, ſine uultum declinando in terram*, which (faith hee) wee vſe to ſay kneeling, or bowing our faces to the earth, as hath beeſe ſhewed.

## C A P. 27.

The former Instances were of times preceding those wherein the Doctrine of the Reall preſence was batched.

1. It may not bee truely objected that, at this time, the Doctrine of the Reall preſence was ſettled in the Church of Rome; and that therefore, they now began to vſe this bowing at the Conſecration. For this Booke doth not ſhew what was then made, but what was alſo before that time the received fashion of the Romane Church.

2. Neither was the Doctrine of Christs Reall preſence in his naturall body, then received of that Church, howeuer Amalarius himſelfe muttereth ſomething of it, whose error was then oppoled and censured by a Synod held at Carisacum, as is ſhewed by that moft reverend and learned <sup>a</sup> Archbiſhop of Armach. Doctor Vſber.

Yea, and Paschasius Radbertus, who liued ſomewhat later then Amalarius, viz. An. 880. and did indeed teach the Reall preſence of Christs naturall body, in and with the Bread, which is Conſubſtantiation. (For of the Bread it ſelue, he ſaith that, the body diſteſteth it [Eſi <sup>b</sup> corpus diſterit quod extra eſt] which hee calleth ſtill Bread, as well after as before Conſecration; and affirmeth, that alone to profit nothing) yet this man confeſſeth, [Andiui quoſdam me reprehendere, &c.] that his opinion was reproved of others as exceilue and beyond the truth, &c. Whereby is manifest, that, as yet, it was but an errore creeping into the Church, as appeareth by the confeſſed oppositions of Bertram, alias Ratranus, Rabanus, and others mentioned in the learned Anſwer of that Reve-

a Anſwer to a Challenge p. 73 and 74.

b Paschas. Radbertus in Mar. l. 12. Tom. 9. Bib pat. Colton. part 2 pag. 1202. column. I. c Ibid. p. 1201.

Reuerend Bishop, quo supra. To which I will adde the Testimony of <sup>d</sup> Christianus Grammaticus, alias Druchmarus, d Tom 9. Bibl. in his exposition on *Mash. 16.26.* [ *Deditque discipulis suis pat. Colon part & misit, accipite & comedite, hoc est corpus meum* ] *Dedit discipulis suis Sacramentum corporis sui in remissionem peccatorum* <sup>I. pag 934. column. 1. D.</sup> *& conseruationem charitatis, ut memores illius faciat, semper hoc sit.* *Anno. 870.*  
*in figura ficerent, quod pro ihs acturus erat, non obliniscerentur,*  
[ *Hoc est corpus meum* ] i.e. in *Sacramento.* & post. *Sicut de-*  
*nique si aliquis peregre proficiens, dilectoribus suis quoddam*  
*vinculum dilectionis relinquit, eo tenore ut omni die hoc agant,*  
*ut illius non obliniscantur: Ita Deus praecepit agi a nobis, transfe-*  
*rens spiritualiter corpus in panem (ut in margine, panem in cor-*  
*pus) & vinum in sanguinem, ut per hec Deo mensoremus que*  
*fecit pro nobis de corpore & sanguine suo, & non sumus ingrati-*  
*ciam amansissima charitatis. [ And hee gave it to his disciples,*  
“ saying, take, eate, this is my body] *Hee gave to his disciples*  
“ *the Sacrement of his body for remission of sinnes, and*  
“ *conseruation of charity, that so they being mindfull of his*  
“ *act, might alwayes doe this in a figure, which hee was a-*  
“ *bout to doe; and should not forget it. (This is my body)*  
“ *that is, in a Sacrement, or mysterie. And after, lastly as*  
“ *if one going a journey should leaue some bond of loue a-*  
“ *mong his friends, on condition that every day they should*  
“ *doe such a thing, that they might not bee vnmindfull of*  
“ *him: So God hath charged vs to doe, spiritually chan-*  
“ *ging (the body into bread: for so the margent hath it)*  
“ *bread into his body, and wine into his blood, that by*  
“ *these wee might remember what Christ hath done for*  
“ *vs of his body and blood, and not bee ungrateful to a most*  
“ *louing charity.*

*Florus Magister* who liued An. 860. (as Coccinus) wrote *Bibl. Pat. Tom.*  
an Exposition of the Massie, wherein hee hath these words, *i. part 2. pag.*  
*Cum panis & vini creatura in Sacramentum carnis & sanguinis eius ineffabili spiritus sanctificatione, transferatur, manducatur Christus: Per partes manducatur in Sacramento, & manet integer totus in celo, manet integer totus in corde tuo.* When  
the creature of bread and wine is changed into the flesh and  
blood of Christ by the ineffable sanctification of the spirit,

Christ is eaten : hee is eaten by parts in the Sacrament, and whole Christ remaines whole in heauen, whole Christ remaines whole in thy heart. Whereby is manifest that he beleueued not either *Consubstantiation*, or *Transubstantiation*, but a *Sacramentall eating* of Christ in the iuyssies apart, and a *spirituall Communication* of whole Christ to the heart, euen as wee doe. Hence he there also saith, *Totum hoc quod in hac oblatione corporis & sanguinis Domini agitur, mysterium est ; aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur, quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur* (hee saith not *quod inest*) *fructum habet spiritualm* : All that is done in this oblation of the body and blood of the Lord, is a *Mysterie* : one thing is seene, another is vnderstood : that which is seene hath a bodily shape, that which is *vnderstood* (hee saith not *which is in or vnder the bread*) *hath a spiruall fuit*.

Yea, that then the Church of *Rome* did not beleue any such *Reall-presence*, as after it did, may appeare by these Arguments.

1. That they did not vnderstand the *Bread* to bee made the *very body of Christ* by vertue of any words of consecration vsed by the Priest ; but, by the *ineffable working of the Holy Ghost*, as *Florus* saith. And secondly, not the body of Christ + in it selfe, but to the *faithfull Receiuer*, to whom the *Holy Ghost* doth communicate the true body and blood of Christ *spiritually*, vnto life. Therefore was the prayer in the *Roman* order at the *consecration* (when none were present, but *Communicantes* such as were to communicate) *ut oblation fiat nobis corpus & sanguis Domini*, that the oblation may bee made to vs the body and blood of the Lord : not, *ut fiat*, simply that it may bee made, but (*nobis*, to vs) i.e. as is after expressed, *nobis accipientibus*, to vs the *Receivers*. They did not then, thinke the *Bread* to bee made the *Body of Christ*, in it selfe ; and to *gazers* on but to the *faithfull Receivers*, [*Vt efficiatur fidelibus corpus & sanguis Christi*,] hat it may be made

*a Michrol. de  
Missa rite co-  
lebranda c. 14.*

*b Florus ibid.  
quo supra.*

so to beleuers saith *b Florus*. Indeed the *Roman* *Missall* retaineth still the word [*nobis*] and the words *quaesumus* : ] and vs them when the *Priest* alone communicates, making a solecisme betwixt the old words and the new

prac-

practise. Thirdly, they did not thinke, that which they saw to bee the *Species* of *Bread and Wine*; and to haue vnder that shew, the boay of Christ; but that which they saw, to be the body of Christ, i.e. In a mysterie, *Cuius corpus ibi confringit videmus & credimus*, whose body wee see and beleue to be there broken faith *Micrologus*. So it wasthe body of Christ as they saw it, and saw it broken, which could not bee laid of his naturall body, but only of the mysterie or *Sacrament* of his body.

*Quo supra.  
cap. 18.*

4. They did not beleue whole Christ to bee in either *Species*, as must needs haue beeene beleueed, if they had conceited that his very naturall body had beeene in, or with the Bread or Cup, or existent vnder the shewes of them: For *Florus* expreſſly saith, *Wee receive him in the Sacrament per partes* by parts. And therefore, to teach the people, that however in the *Sacrament* they receiue the body and blood of Christ apart, as communicating with him in his death; yet, whole and living Christ is ſpirituallly communicated to their ſoules to giue them life. The Romane Church obſerued this Ceremony, that at [*Pax tecum*] when the Bishop after *Ordo Rom. quo* the conſecration, came to receiue ſitting in his ſeat, he brea-*ſupra. pa. 401.*king a piece of the Bread, and putting it into the Cup then held before him, ſaid, *Fiat commixtio corporis & ſanguinis Christi nobis accipientibus in vitam aeternam*, let there bee a commixtion of the body and blood of Christ to vs receiving it, vnto eternall life: meaning thereby, to ſignifie the vniuing of Christ's body and blood in his Resurrection, and to pray, that by vertue of partaking of Christ raised from the dead to dye no more, they which partaked his body and blood apart in the mysteries, might liue for euer. The words [*Et c 31. Expositio Conſecratio*] are now found in the Romane Order aforelaid, *Missa Egit. per Amalar de officio Missa l. 3. Coccini. pa. 142.* but were not ſo (as it ſeemeth) in that copie, which *Amalarius* then followed. For he, out of that *Ordo Romanus*, re- porteth onely heſe words, *Fiat commixtio corporis & ſanguinis Christi nobis accipientibus in vita aeternam*; but no word of *Conſecration*. Nor doth it fit the matter intended. For the Bishop did not meane to conſecrate a *Sacrament* of Christ's Resurrection. And both the Bread and Cup were conſecrated before.

before. The present Roman Missall observeth the Ceremony of putting a parcell of the Host into the Cup, at that time of [ *Pax tecum:* ] but hath, without any great shew of change, altered the words, and to another meaning. For whereas it was onely said, *Fiat commixtio corporis Christi,* &c. which is in plaine termes, *Let the Resurrection of Christ profit us to eternall life, who receive the Eucharist.* They haue now made it, *Hac commixtio & consecratio corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi fiat nobis, &c.* as meaning to teach that there is, in the very Sacramentall signes, or under them, a mixture of Christ's Body and Blood made; and so a presence of whole Christ in every drop of wine, and crumme of the bread by Concomitancie. *Hac Commixtio fiat.*

Lastly, that the Romane Church did not then beleue any Real presence of Christ, as brought under the Species, by the Priests, and formall words of Consecration, appeareth by this, that when the Bishop did consecrate, there was but one Chalice, or cup of wine before him: of which a little was after powred into other vessels of wine, to consecrate that for the Communicants, *Quia vinum etiam non consecratum sed sanguine Domini commixtum sanctificatur per omnem modum,* because the Wine that yet was not consecrated, but onely mixed with the Blood of our Lord, is sanctified altogether: whereas now, the Consecration is limited to certaine formall words, and to onely so much as the Priest intendeth to consecrate; because forsooth, no more can be made the Body or Blood of Christ then is at that instant, turned therenunto. Wherefore I now assume as manifest, that the Romane Church was not as yet, nor before the 900 yeere of our Lord, possessed of the dotages either of *Consubstantiation*, or *Transubstantiation*. And yet euen then obserued, vpon the Station dayes, when they might not kneele in publike prayer, yet at the Celebration of the Sacrament to bow downe themselues in those prayers ( wherein they might not kneele) in token of their humble and reverend acknowledgement of the speciall grace of God, signed, sealed and exhibited to them thereby. And, that they likewise had care, in the act of receyving, to discerne the Lords Body reverentia sing-

singulariter debita, with reverence then specially due to it, as Augustine speaketh, no man can doubt. For therfore *Rbe-*  
*miges* the Bishop of *Rhemes*, in *I. Cor. 11.24. &c.* coupleth  
 the consecration and participation in that respect, laying, *Quo-*  
*tioseunque accedimus ad consecrandum, vel percipiendum. Sa-*  
*cramentum muneris eterni, quod nobis Dominus p̄fissimis in me-*  
*memoriam sui dimisit tenendum, cum timore & compunctione cor-*  
*dis, omnisque reverentia debemus accedere:* So often as wee  
 come to consecrate or partake the Sacrament, &c. we ought  
 to come thereto with feare and compunction of heart, and  
 with all reuerence. So also before him *Casarinus Arelaten-*  
*sis, hom. 12.* alledged by the Bishop of Rochester, sheweth  
 that during that Action the people were required to abide  
 in the Church, *Humiliato corpore & compuncto corde*, with  
 humbled bodies and compunction of heart. This reuerend  
 carriage *Wall. Strabo* sheweth to belong to *Decencie* and to  
 Order required of *Paul, I. Cor. 14.* which *Decorum* or *De-*  
*cencie* being requisite *In singulis sanctorum operibus, tamen e-*  
*tiam atque etiam in sanctissimi sanguinis & corporis veneratione*  
*sernari debet, &c.* in all workes of the Saints, much more  
 ought it to bee obserued in the veneration of the most ho-  
 ly body and blood of Christ, &c. and after, *Secundum ordi-*  
*nem autem, ut sanctificationem eorum a cibis ceteris longe dista-*  
*re sciamus,* It is according to *Order*, that wee may know  
 that the sanctification of those doe differ farre from other  
 meates. There hee treateth of the receiving of the Commu-  
 nion *fasting*, and proueth the fitnessse of it, from the respect  
 of that *Decencie* and *Order*, in which it ought to bee recei-  
 ved, and which requireth sober men. This man was so far  
 from the thought of *Table gesture*, as he taketh it to belong  
 to *Order* that the great distance betwixt this and common  
 food, should be shewed in the bodily receiving. Yea hee cal-  
 leth the very *Act* of receiuing veneration, because it was  
 received with veneration, like as *Paul* understandeth  
*Prayer* by *bowing of the knee*, because that was the common  
 gesture; *For this cause doe I bow the knee to God, &c.* So *Stra-*  
*bo* saith, in the veneration of the blood and body of Christ, in  
 stead of [in the receiving] because it was not received but

*Romig vixit*  
*An. 390. habe-*  
*rur in Bibl.*  
*Patr. Tom. 5.*  
*part. 3 pag 887*  
*Column. 2. A.*

*Treat. of knee-*  
*ling, pag 195.*

*Wall. Strabo*  
*de ritibus Eccle-*  
*sasticis cap. 19*

*Ephes. 3.14.*

with

with veneration; that is, Externall Adoration of Bowing or Kneeling.

## C A P. 28.

## The second Observation in the practise of the Ancient Churches.

My second Observation is, that to take it of the Ministers hands, and to partake, or receive into their mouths, was not alwayes the same; nor alwayes done at the same time, or in the same place. For they did for a long time take it at the Church, carry it home, and there receive it. And after the Councells of Toledo, and the Casar-Augustan Councell had tyed them to assumere in Ecclesia, receive it in the Church, they did yet, in the Greeke Church, come vp to the Table, or Chancell, to take the Bread standing, but stayed not to eat it there, but carried it to their owne places, and there (after priuate prayer for themselves) did eat it kneeling, as (out of Sozomen) hath beeene shewed. As for the Cup, because they could not take that away with them, as they did the Bread, they did receive that Adoring, as hath beeene shewed out of Cyri.

Ordo Rom. quo  
supra. Tom. 8.  
Bibl. Patr. pag.  
403.

Lib. Sacrar.  
Ceremon. 2.  
pag. 181.

Diffts. against  
Kneeling, and  
Altare Da-  
masc.

And in the Roman Church, the Priests and Deacons called Ministers of the Altar, came to the Bishop then sitting in his Seat, kissed him, tooke the bread of his hand, and then went away in sinistra parte Altaris communicaturi, to the left side of the Altar to partake it, where there can bee no doubt whether they did kneele, or no, if we remember what hath beene alleadged out of Micrologus. And as for the Sub-Deacons that were not allowed to goe to the Altar to Communicate, they came to the Bishops seat, kissed his hand, and tooke it in their mouthes, but not in their hands, which any man must conceiue to be kneeling, as the Booke of Ceremonies expreſſly affirmeth. The Bishop, and others at his appointment, carried vnto the people, in their owne places, and put it into their mouthes, which I know not how they should well doe, without that the Receivers kneeld. So then the Testimonies brought by some men, to proue that they did of older times, receive it standing, are true for the act of taking,

in those times and places, of which their Authors speake; but not true of the act of receiving or communicating. That the Priest now receiueth standing at the Altar, and not kneeling, as of old; I conceiue to be done for the feare of shedding. But it was not so before the Monster of Transubstantiation, I am sure.

## C A P. 29.

*The third Observation in the ancient practises  
of the Churches.*

**T**He third observation is, that besides the *Solemn Common Prayers*, at which they might not kneele, but onely stand, in some of them *inclinarunt*, bowing themselves, as at the *Celebration*. Both the Priest and people, had sometimes their private *devotions*, at which they might, and did vle to kneele, euен on those *Station dayes*, and such kneeling was not taken to bee any breach of the Canon made for standing on such dayes, in *Prayer*.

The *Romane order* aforesaid sheweth, how the Bishop, addressing himselfe to the *consecration*, while the *Quier* sung, *Glorie bee to the Father, &c.* the hymme which giueth glory to the Trinity. *Pontifex concelebrat secreto orationem ante Altare inclinatus usque ad repetitionem*, the Bishop celebrateth a prayer in priuate bowing himselfe at the Altar vntill the repetition: not *stans inclinatus*; but absolutely, *Inclinatus* bowing himselfe. And that the Priest likewise immediately before his receiving did so, *Non ex aliquo ordine sed ex religiosorum traditione*, not by appointment but by tradition, wee haue before obserued out of *Micrologus, de Off. Miss. c. 18.*

This is (as I take it) the thing aimed at in that Decree of Alexander the third, who Poped Ann. 1159. somewhat before Innocent the third, or Honorius; which Decree is pressed by *Altare Damascenum*, to proue that neither the Priest in consecrati<sup>ng</sup>, nor the people in receiving were permitted, on those *Festivals* to kneele. The Decree is this. *Decretum Gregorii VIII lib. 2 Tit. 9 cap. bus Dominicis & alijs pricipiis Festiuitatibus, inter Pascha & quoniam.*

Pente-

*Alt. Damasc.**pag. 786.**Decret. Greg.**lib. 2 Tit. 9 cap.*

Pentecostem genuflexio nequaquam fieri debet, nisi aliquis ex Devotione velit facere in secreto. In consecrationibus Episcoporum, & Clericorum ordinationibus, consecrantes & consecratis tantum genuflexere possunt, secundum quod consecrationis modus requiri. Upon Lords dayes and other chiefe Festivals, kneeling ought not to bee vsed: vnlesse any dispose to doe it priuately. In the consecrations of Bishops, and ordination of Ministers both the consecrators and consecrated may kneele according to that which the manner of consecration requireth. You see (saith the *Altar of Damascus*) that the consecrating and consecrated, in *Ordinations* are excepted; but not, the Consecrator, nor Receiver of the mysteries, *Exceptio firmat regulam in casibus non exceptis*, an exception establisheth a rule in all cases not excepted. But this mans earnestnesse suffered him not to see, that there is an exception made, in this Decree, of *kneeling out of Devotion in private*, which might haue, and I thinke had respect to those kneelings both of Priest and people at the receiving of the Sacrament, when they vsed private prayers; The Priest for himself, and people euery one for himself, as hee received.

*Ordo Rom.*  
Tom. 8. Bibl.  
Pat. pag. 399.  
column. 2. lit. D.

And this kneeling could not be vnderstood a breach of the Decree of the first *Nicen councell*, for standing on those dayes at prayer; for, that was vnderstood of their *solemne publicke prayers*, made when all the congregation, in (as it were) profession of Christ's *Resurrection*, were enjoyned to stand. For after they once came to the deliuery of the Sacrament, vntill it was all finished, the *Anthem*(as they called it) i.e. their singing by turnes, for the Communion was continued. So as there was, for that time, no publicke office of prayer in hand. And that the Decree of *Alexander* had respect vnto such *private devotionaly prayers*, is probable by the words of the *Glosse* in the title of that Decree, which is this. *In precipitis Festis, & intra Pascha & Pentecosten non sit solennis genuflexio*: In principall Festivals and betweene Easter, and Whitsuntide, there must be no *solensne Kneeling*; i.e. not of the whole congregation together. And this is yet made more probable, if not more then probable, by the words of *Wall. Strabo*, who saith, *Quibus horis & temporibus, what hours*

*De rebus Ecclesiasticis cap.*  
25. neere the beginning.

houres and times, wee must pray without kneeling, *In publica officia, Canones ostendunt*, in the publicke offices the Canons doe shew. *In Dominicis Festis maioribus & quinquagesima iuxta quos Canones publice panitentes semper genua flectere debent*: Upon more solemnne Lords dayes and in the week before Lent, according to the Canons, the Penitentiaries do alwayes publickely kneele. Where we see, for our purpose two things. 1. That the restraint of Kneeling in prayer, is limited *in publica officia*, while they are performing publicke offices. 2. That *open Penitentiaries* were by Canon to kneele cuen in those dayes, because that this gesture of one, two, three, or a few, was not held a breach of that other Canon which respecteth the assembly joynly. And if, without breach of that Canon, the *open Penitents* might kneele then at the *solemne publicke prayers*, how could the *private kneeling* of each Cotcommunicant in his turne, bee vnderstood a breach thereof, when this was done while all the *publicke solemnne prayers* ceased, and *hymnes onely* were sung?

C A P. 30.

*The fourth Obseruation touching the same.*

**T**He fourth *Obseruation* is, that howeuer in the time of *Justin Martyr, An. 150.* at least in some places, the Communicants appeare to haue come up to the Table, and taken euery man his portion: yet *An. 200.* in *Tertullianus* time, they tooke it not, but *ex Presidentium manu*, from the hand of the Pastors. And that euer since, for ought appeareth, it hath beene deliuered by the Minister onely, or by his hands the *Deacons*, though *Altare Damascenum* like it not: And, as hath beene shewed, was alwayes deliuered with a *briose prayer* forgoing it, which hee liketh not neither.

C A P. 31.

*The fifth Obseruation.*

**T**He fifth *Obseruation* is, That in many (if not most) Churches through the world, they did celebrate the Com-

Communion, every day. Which as a thing vndoubted of, I forbear to proue.

### C A P . 32.

#### *The last Observuation together with Answers to the Obiections made against Kneeling.*

*Synod.Turon.  
cap.37.*

**T**He last Observuation is, That on all other dayes, saue the Lords dayes and Pentecost, they were, by Order, to make all their prayers, *fixis in terram genibus, kneeling* both in *Tertullians* time, and so along. Now, if by Order, they then prayed *kneeling*, and a *prayer* was made for *each Communicant* at the time of *delivery*; and he for himselfe, at the receiving had a *short prayer*; who can perswade himselfe, that they did not on all those dayes receive it *kneeling*? And if it bee, (as *Aliare Damascenum* saith it is) most like that they received it on those dayes; as they did, on the Lords dayes: Then say I, that on the Lords dayes also, they did receive it *kneeling*; And, on the weeke dayes were bound so to doe, by that Decree which required them to *kneele in all their prayers*, consequently. That there is not to bee found any Decree for the gesture of *kneeling* in the *Act of receiving*, no not in the *Romane-Church*, before, or after the *Reall presence*, nor yet in the *Grecce Church* (where yet they vted to *kneele*) doth manifest both the Antiquity and vniuersality of this Ceremony, which out of a common notion of all Christians (that in partaking of the body and blood of the Sonne of God, it was comely for them to expresse, *renuerentiam singulariter debitam*) did make it selfe a *Law* vnto them, without any Decree, as out of *Tertullian* I haue shewed before.

And therefore, against *Aliare Damasc.* I say with Master *Bеза*, that this gesture of *Adoration in receiving*, was in *use* and *state* long before the *Reall presence* was hatched; and was taken vp by the brewers of that Dreame, and pleaded as an Argument for the *Reall presence*, as if the worship intended to the person of Christ sitting in Heauen, had beeene alwayes meant to him as contained in the *Bread and Wine*, or

*showes*

showes thereof; which is so professedly manifest in *Algerius*, *Bibl. Patr. Co-*  
*who liued anno 1060, as nothing can bee more. Cassianus* *lon. Tom. 12.*  
*videtur tot hominum hnic Sacramento ministrantium, vol ado-* *part. I. pag. 435*  
*rantium veneranda sedulitas, nisi ipsius Sacramentis longe maior* *colum. 2.*  
*crederetur, quam videtur veritas et utilitas; Cum ergo exterius* *Vel de Sacra-*  
*quasi nulla sine quibus tanta impenduntur venerationis obsequia,* *mentis lib. 2. c. 2.*  
*aut insensatis summis, aut ad intima mississ magna salutis myste-*  
*ria: the venerable diligence of so many both administering*  
*and adoring this Sacrement, seemes vaine, vnlesse the truth*  
*and profit of the Sacrement were not beleueed to bee farre*  
*greater then can bee scene with the eye: Seeing therefore*  
*those things which appeare outwardly, are almost no-*  
*thing; either wee are senselesse in bestowing so much a-*  
*doration vpon it, or else wee dee looke vpon some internall*  
*mysteries of great saluation in it: which though it was*  
*no good argument, yet it was an Argument for defect of a*  
*better.*

I therefore conclude, that *Kneeling in the act of receiving,*  
*Was not brought into the Church by Antichrist; nor ever was yet*  
*strengthened with any Papall Decree; but hath been made a foot-*  
*banke unto that Antichristian monster of Transubstantiation,*  
*onely by mis-interpretation of it, by such as sought out all*  
*meanes, and laid hold on any colourable thing, that might*  
*suckle the monster of their braine, when it was once borae.*  
*Berza therefore, and other Churches which line pell-mell*  
*with the Popish, where Idolatry is openly in the streetes*  
*committed, in bowing to a piece of Bread, as if it were no-*  
*thing else but Christ himselfe shifted into a new suit of*  
*apparell, had reason enough to forbear this gesture in their*  
*Churches: and to dissuade it, as a thing which had beeene,*  
*and therefore may bee dangerous. And therefore Berza doth*  
*nowhere condemne the use of it as in it selfe unlawfull, but*  
*onely defend the Churches which, in respect of the perill*  
*that might ensue, or out of a desire to roote the Bread-wor-*  
*ship out of the mindes of men, doe decline the use of this*  
*Ceremony.*

And this (what ever that fiery, though learned man,  
which compiled *Altare Damascenum*, say to the contrary)

*Berza Epist. 12*  
*& adversus*  
*Hesbusum in*  
*Opusculis pag.*  
*311. & quest.*  
*& respons.*  
*Quest. 243.*  
*Edit. 1570.*

was the judgement of all those Divines, who, in the name of  
 the French and Dutch Churches, made certaine obserua-  
 tions vpon the Harmony of confessions set out at Geneva, in Be-  
 za his time, An. 1581. For in their fourth Obseruation vp-  
 on the confession of Bohemia, in Sect. 14. Confess. de Cana;  
*Harm. Confess Edit. Genes.*  
 16.1. Sect. 14.  
 pag. 120.  
 and on these words, *Populus autem fidelium usitatissime in*  
*genua preambens hoc accipit, the faithfull most viually re-*  
*ceiue it kneeling on their knees; say thus: In hoc etiam ritu*  
*suum cuique Ecclesia libertatem saluam relinquendam arbitra-*  
*mur: non quod per se hunc morem damnamus, (cum hac cau-*  
*ione de qua modo diximus observatione quartâ) sed quoniam ad*  
*apologetiar ex animis enclendam, praestit plurisq; locis eam co-*  
*remoniam aboleri, in ipsorum signorum sumptuone, de qua vid. su-*  
*prâ obseruat. 1. ad Helveticam priorem. In this rite also, we*  
*leau each Church to her owne liberty; nor that wee con-*  
*demne it simply as euill in it selfe (vsed with caution giuen*  
*in our fourth Obseruation) but for the rooting of Bread-*  
*worship out of mens minds, it is better that in most places it*  
*were casheired, &c. Where is manifest that they judge this*  
*Ceremony, in it selfe lawfull; and therefore leau all Churches*  
*to their owne liberty, only with caution, that it bee not vsed*  
*as any meanes to cherish the Bread-worship. For which,*  
*both the Articles of our Religion, and the Declaration related*  
*before, haue put in good caution. As for the rest, they doe*  
*rather make a good defence for such Churches as do forbearo*  
*it, then at all condemne any that vse it.*

And *Dialecticon Eucharisticum* printed and published with  
 the second volume of Beza his Workes, and in his life time,  
 at Geneva, Ann. 1570. saith, *Veneris Eucharistiam cum sum-*  
*maruerentia & magno honore tutos tamen ab idolatria fuisse,*  
*quod nobis etiam antiquâ disciplina renocata & catechisme for-*  
*mâ restituta contingere. The Ancients received the Eucha-*  
*rism with all reverence and great honour (that is, as hee saith*  
*on the next page, *adorantes*, adoring it) and yet were free*  
*from all Idolatry, which also wee might doe, by recalling*  
*the ancient discipline, and restoring the forme of catechisme.*

The Bread-worship was brought in by Antichrist indeed,  
 and was as *Cosier* (though to another purpose) saith, the  
 grea-

greatest idolatry that euer was in the world, if the Bread bee not turned into the true and naturall body of Christ ; as, vpon my ioule, it is not.

This Ceremony was not brought in by him, but turned from the Creator by an horrible blindnesse, to the creature ; from which, it wee returne it to the true owners of all religious Adoration, shall this bee our sinne, or theirs that will needs condemne vs ? I lament to see the transport of Passion of such as say, *the Formalists seeme to believe the Reall presence in the Elements* ; which, if it bee true, God will judge vs ; if not, hee that accuseth falsely is guilty of that which he objecteth as a slander ; and by the law of God, to beare the same punishment.

*Object.* There remaineth the last Objection, viz. *That it is not lawfull to kneele before a consecrated creature ; Ergo, not to kneele in receiving the Communion.*

*Answ.* The Antecedent is not simply true. The consequence will not hold, if the Antecedent were absolutely true ; therefore, the Argument failes. The humane nature of Christ is a consecrated creature, and yet was it lawfull to bow before it, as the flesh of God.

The Arke of God, the Temple, the Holy Mountaine, the Altar of God, were meere creatures consecrated of God. So was the Bush Cloud, the fire which came from heauen, for that present vse of them : yet the people of God ( as hath beeene said ) bowed before them, worshipping not the creature, but the Creator ; and that they did this lawfully ( though it was not so commanded of God ) wee haue heard out of *Alia-re Damascenus*, and are well assured, out of the Scriptures, *Psal. 99. 6. 8. &c.* The termes therefore of bowing before must bee stated in some certaine meaning to make the Antecedent true.

1. Bowing before, is sometimes, onely bowing downe, when a thing is before vs ; and is *in sensu dinisho*, in a diuided fense ; when the bowing hath no intendment to that thing which is before vs. And thus when ever wee bow downe, wee must needs bow before some creature ; consecrated, or not, maketh no difference in this Notion.

2. Bowing before a creature, is in sensu coniuncto, in a conjunctive sense; and is twofold, first when the creature is respected only as *obiectum à quo*, the object from which, not *ad quod* to which we take occasion to bow, by occasion wherof wee bow our selues not at all to the consecrated creature, but vnto God who hath sanctified the creature to bee a signe of his presence, or speciall grace, of which sort are the instances giuen, and this is also lawfull.

3. Bowing before, is also sometimes bowing to the creature, i.e. to determine the Adoration in the creature, whether for it owne sake, or in Relation to something else, as the Papists mostly profess their bowing to bee done to their Images of Christ, &c. And to the very Species of bread and wine, as vntited or conjoyned to the person of Christ. And thus to bow to any consecrated creature, or before it, is Idolatry; and so it is, to bare the head, or kiss the hand, as the old Idolaters did when the Image of Serapis passed by them. He that shall charge this Church so to bow to the consecrated creature, either for it selfe, or for Christs sake, shall apparantly slander it. See before the Churches publicke Declaration.

*Minutius Fa-*  
*lix in Oct. apud*  
*Arnobium.*

But suppose it were vnlawfull to bow before a consecrated creature, respectiuely to it as an occasiōnal obiect onely: and to make the Antecedent thus; It is vnlawfull to bow downe to God before any Consecrated creature, respectiuely as an obiect, from whence wee take occasion to bow: yet will not the Consequence hold, that therefore it is vnlawfull to receive the Sacramens kneeling. For it is not ordayned, nor understood in this Church, that the Kneeling hath any respect vnto the Consecrated Creature, so much as *Obiectum à quo*, but onely hath a respect vnto the Declaration of our humble acknowledging the benefits internally communicated to the worthy Receiver. And therefore there is no shew of Adoration made before the Consecrated creatures, when they stand on the Table before vs, or at any time else; but onely we kneele in the act of receiving them. Nor doth the Minister come alwayes before, but more vsually on the one side of the Communicants disposed in their Seats. The Signes there-

therefore are but accidentally before the Communicants, when they receive; that is, for the reason of the Distribution, and not of purpose brought before them, to take up any Adoration by the sight of them vnto God.

*Altare Damascenum*, taking it for graunted, that *Wee* adore Christ before the holy signes occasionally as before obiects à quo, telleth vs, that this is all one with that Image-worship, which some of the learned Papists, as *Durandus* and *Holcot*, &c. doe allow, who would not haue the Adoration at all referred to the *Image*, but to the *Prototypo*: And, to maintaine his flaunder, is content to say, that their Images also are consecrated. Wherein, beside his mistaking of our Kneeling, hee commits two faults; one, when hee equivocateth in the tearme *Consecrated*, as it Gods consecration, and that which is merely of men, were alike. A second, when he compareth Images of Gods making and institution, with Images made by the *lust of men* against Gods forbidding.

One man, at the Baptisme of his Childe, will make a Prince to bee one of his Witnesses, or as wee say, *Goffips*; and without asking him leaue, hee sets out a Deputie, and obserueth him with State in reference to the Prince. Another hath the Graunt of the Prince of such a fauour, the Prince designeth his Deputie to represent his Person, that Person is served in State, as if hee were a Prince, not to honour him, but the Prince whom for that time hee personates. Are these two Cases alike warrantable, or alike blameable? Such is our Case: the Papists without leaue make a Crucifixe; and, to the honouring, not of the Crucifixe, but of Christ crucified, doe suite and seruice thereto, or before it respectively to it as a type: wee haue the *Image* of Christ crucified in the *Supper*, by his owne appointment, wee doe our homage before them, not as Creatures, but as his *deputies*, *Sacraments*; nor, at all to them as they are Creatures, but by occasion of them, or by them to Christ whose they are. Is this all one? This I speake *ex Hypothesi*, supposing, not graunting that wee doe performe any Adoration to them in relation to.

Zanch. de vi-  
tis externis.  
cultus i pag.  
497. Edit. 1613

Christ himselfe in our kneeling. Hearc Zanchius. Non inspicere hoc Apostolis loco. (1 Cor. 11. 27.) colligi potest Sacramenta extensis etiam honoris & reverentia signis esse sufficientia, non propter ipsa, sed propter illorum instrumentorum Christum. Nam etiam dominus in lege cum veritate adorari imagines ab hominibus fabricatae, a contrario docuit, Iwas imagines Sacra menta nimis rerum ecclesiasticorum symbola non sine aliqua reverentia & honore esse participanda. Atque hoc observatum vidimus in veteri Ecclesia sum Israelite etiam Christiana. It may not vnfitly bee collected from this place of the Apostle (1. Cor. 11. 27.) that the Sacraments ought to bee honoured with even external signes of honour and reverence, not for themselves, but for their Institutor, Christ. For even in the Law when the Lord forbade the adoring of Images of mens making, on the contrary hee taught that his Images, the Sacraments, being symbotes or signes of heauenly things, should be participated not without some reverence and honour. And this wee see obserued in the ancient Church, as well Israelitish as Christian.

Object. But God hath not appointed the Sacraments to bee Adored, (saith he) or himselfe to bee Adored before them?

Answe. Indeed the Sacraments consisting as well of Actions ordained to bee done by vs: as the Blessing, Breaking, Receiving, Eating and Drinking of the Bread, &c. as of the Elements which are sanctified, cannot bee said to be appointed to bee Adored, vntill wee shall Adore our action of eating the Bread, and drinking of the Cup of our Lord, which is so a part of the Sacrament, that without them it were no Sacrament to vs. That Christ hath not appointed vs to Adore him in the receiving of them, both Internally and Externally, is an hereticall doctrine, though the expression [Externall] bee not determined of him.

Object. But Veneration of the Sacraments, saith Alare Damascenum wee allow; but not Adoration.

Answe. See now that all the strife shall bee about words, which haue (as I haue shewed) no formall difference of signification, but onely by the designation of men in their use, nor in the particular, outward gestures; which, by diuine

uine institution, shall difference the one from the other.

Object. But kneeling is onely lawfull in actions of Adoration, i.e. Divine?

Answe. This is not true, for it is confessed to bee lawfull in Ciuill vse. And I pray you, what action of Gods publicke seruice is there, which is not an Action of Adoration, how euer the expression thereof bee not in every action of his worship necesserily or conueniently one & the same. *Zanch de cultu  
li ex externaque veneratio & Adoratio ad omnes ferme actiones di-  
uini cultus concurrat, visible and externall veneration and A-  
doration concurretes to almost all actions of diuine worship,*  
saith Zanchius. *d. aliud est vnam*

*Zanch de cultu  
li ex externo l.  
1. Tbel 2. in  
fine p.421. E-  
dit. 1610.*

Thus wee kneele while the ten Commandements are read, partly to expresse our respect of that Law giuen by the voice of God himselfe on Mount Sinai, with great state and terror, a Law fit to cast vs downe and humble vs; partly, for the prayer then subjoyned to every precept for Grace to obserue it, and pardon for our failings.

Object. *Geniculando excipere verba ex ore Lectoris aut Concionatoris prolata ratione sanctitatis, effet idolatria,* to receive the word kneeling, as coming from the mouth of a Reader or Preacher in respect of holiness were idolatry.

*Alt. Damasc.  
P 48. 797.*

Answe. This case commeth not home to that of receiving the Sacraments, which, in that Action, wee doe not looke at as creatures, but as *dinina symbola*, signifying and sealing the Couenant of Grace to vs. But yet the Opponent durst not say it is idolatrie to heare the word, kneeling; but, when it is done *ratione sanctitatis* in respect of holiness, which must needs carry it to the person of the Preacher, and not unto God. When Moses and Aaron brought the message to the Elders of Israel, Exod. 4.31. they bowed their heads, no doubt before coram ministro Moses and Aaron, and not at their backes, and worshipped, not the Messengers of God, for their holiness, but God for sending by them that gracious Message. When wee shall profess to bow before, and to the holy mysteries, for respect of their holiness, let vs be branded and not spared; till then it were fit that men spared to calumniate the Seruants and Churches of the living God.

*Externa rever-  
entia est, ut  
post actionem  
sacram, (viz.  
verbum incli-  
nantes deum a-  
derent. Ex 4.  
24. &c 12. 28.  
Neh 8. Apoc.  
3. 9. Psalter.  
Theol. Eliot.  
15. 89. 7, 88.*

## C A P . 33.

The Conclusion consisting of some private occurrents, and requests of his Friend.

**A**nd thus Sir, to satisfie your desire, I haue too largely Answered to the objected Questions propounded in your letter; and almost within the time of three weekes which you limited. If you meeet with needlesse repetitions, and find (as is like you may) many defaults, beare with mee. For I haue written this, as *Ierusalem* was builded, in a troublous time, yea verely in the most troublous time (all things considered) that euer yet came vpon mee, the very houre of darknesse and shaddow of death.

In this time therefore I had cause to looke about mee, and to consider what I had now in hand, which I also did. And if in all this time wherein I haue beeene soaked and laide to steepe in so much tribulation, I had found any wauering or doubtfulnesse in my mind about these matters, I haue written of, assure your selfe I should haue desisted. But standing fully perswaded as in the sight of the Lord, that I haue the truth with mee, and follow it. I did, as by starts and fits I could, proceed, knowing that the line of diuine light ought to sway our judgements, and note either the sun-shine of peace, or shadowes of the euening stretched out vpon vs. Yea and in trath I tooke this task vpon me as a Medicine, to restraine (what I could) my troubled spirit from contained only some nuall feeding vpon that very bitter herbe which had trouprivate faires of his friends, that is here omitted, belonging to the matter here debated.

His private letter contained 2 requests: but because the first of the three concer-

Now I haue two Requests vnto you, one for the Church of God; the other for my selfe.

For the Church of God, I beseech you by our Lord Iesus Christ, that if you thinke as I doe, that the Ceremonies in question, however they may seeme to vs Inconuenient in some respects; yet, are not unlawfull, but such as men (not imprisoned with prejudice) may with good consciences obserue

erue, as matters of exterrnall Order, imposed on vs by lawfull authority. Then sir, doe your best endeavour to hold those that stand wauering vnto their colours. And doe not yet make so much way to any euill affected, or open enemies to our Religion, nor weaken our party against the common Aduersaries of our faith, by disunion of themselues. Let not, for these things in which the kingdome of God standeth not, those things in which it doth stand, bee abandoned. Let no man build vpon his former perswasion, which can excuse no longer then till it bee better informed. Let no man walke after the Tradition of men, though good and learned. Nay let them consider that of graue and holy *Zausby*, who writing one Epistle to Queene Elizabeth for Abatement of these Ceremonies, withall wrote another at the same time to that Reuerend and holy Bishop *Jewell* to perswade the Ministers not to leaue their functions for those things, if the Queene would not remoue them, or slacke the vrging of them. Tell them <sup>a</sup> how *Calvin*, though hee disliked the reducing of wafer-bread into *Genaea* in the time of his exile, yet at his returne never liked to struggle for the change of 1538. p. 368. Remember them of that praise which Master *Fox* gaue to that worthy Bishop and Martyr <sup>b</sup> *Hosper*, how for the publicke seruice of the Church he bare and suffered patiently the private contumely of his *Conformity*. And wish them to take heed that they regard not too much mans day; For he that shall judge vs, is God. As for your selfe, I hope there will bee no need to bid you looke vpon the wonderfull blessing of God vpon you and your Ministry, aboue many of vs, while you haue vsed these things with a good conscience. Sirre vp our brethren who haue some authority in the hearts of those godly people, who are vnhappily transported to an vnutterable dislike of these things which they vnderstand not, and to file off that rough edge of their not so-much *opinions*, as *detestation*. And doe what you can to moue all such as need it, to consideration, whether it shall not bee better, and vpon their deatk-bed more cordiall, to beare (not being *unlawfull*) the vte of these things, rather then to occasion the rending of the Church, the displeasure

*Epist. lib. p.*

391.

*a Beza opusc.  
in vita Calvini  
ni ad Ann.*

*b Fox, Martyr.  
p. 131.*

of our Gouernours, the stopping of our mouthes, the defolation (for oughe we know) of our flockes, the distresse of our families, and withdraw (which is not the least) the confirming of an error (by our if not doctrine, yet example) in the hearts of all thole, who are, or shall bee led to condemne as vntolerable, that which God will justifie as lawfull in vs; and so doth, as I am fully perswaded, by his Word.

Touching my selfe, I haue these requests to you; that you would remit this tract vnto mee againe, without giuing any copy of it, that I may (which I now could not) reuise, and amend it. And let me haue your free judgement of it; and if you take mee to bee deciu'd, set vp some cleare light before mee, and pray that mine eyes may bee opened. And I shall giue glory to God, who knoweth the vprightnesse of my heart in this matter.

For the rest, commend mee to my friends, more specially to my &c. Let mee yet, of the little patch of life remaining, haue some releefe of comfort in your loue continued. And aboue all, pray for mee that the Lord who chastiseth, would keepe mee in his loue, burne out the drosse that is in mee, sanctifie mee wholly to himselfe, and the seruice of his Church, and keepe mee (as I hope hee will) fast knit vnto himselfe in Christ, and when the time commeth; yea, and till then, vouchsafe to honour his owne name in my life and death. *Farewell.*

**F I N I S.**

vin, persuaded others, not to struggle about it, nor ever did thinke fit himselfe to contend shewabont, after hee was recalld to Geneva, however he liked it not so well, saith Beza. Of whose wildome, if you could learne to doe the like, this Controversie were ended. Where marke, that the judgement of that Church of Geneva, which hath continued the vse of Wafers-Bread now about 80. yeares, crosseth your opinion touching abused Ceremonies.

5. You also doe abuse the Defendant and your Reader, in talking of a long leaps as you doe : For the Defendant objecting your Confessions, as well as your Practise, as Contradictorie to your Conclusions, gives this as an Instance of your Confessions, and not of your Practise ; which either you did see, or might have seene, if you had not wrought your selfe out of your geares, by your vntruly lightnesse, and eagernessee after squibs and scornes.

You have now a true Answer to your Questions, and for ought I see, neither doe, nor can deliver your owne Confessions and Practises from Contradiction to your Conclusions. Of which let the Reader judge.

---

## A Postscript to the Reader.

**T**HOU hast, in this my Reioynder, so much as I had written about fourteene yeares sithence, and more; except some few Additionals lately made by mine owne hand, or appointment, For though I did at the first intend (as is in the Preface affirmed) an Answere to the whole Reply made to Bishop MORTON's Generall Defence, &c. Yet had the earnest dissuasion of some prevailed so farre with me, as to suspend for a long time my purposes both of proceeding in the rest, and of publishing what I had done.

But when a strait charge was layde upon me by Supreame Authoritie, forthwith to deliver my Papers on that Subiect to my Reverend Diocesan, Obedience would not suffer mee to detaine

detaynethem until I might adde the Remaineder, for which I  
had no command or direction.

I have therefore by advice of some grave and Godly Persons, onely added as a Supplement, a little Treatise concerning the same Ceremonies: wherein (beside many things brought closer together, which are in the Rejoynder dispersed,) some other Objections are solved; and, the poynct of Kneeling in receiving of the Holy Communion, more fully debated.

The Replier shall finde (I hope) no great cause of asking more worke; and as little of insulting, as if those two following Arguments were more impregnable, than the foure already encountered. For, (beside that he may obserue a sure foundation of Answer to them, laid occasionally, in the discussing of the<sup>1</sup>; and, in that little Tract annexed to this Rejoynder:) I would haue him and all men to know, that the Argument from scandall and appearance of evill<sup>a</sup>, which is the one, and that of Infringing Christian libertie<sup>b</sup>, which is the other of the two remaining Arguments, are answerable in few words: viz. that in mitterendum propter scandalum acceptum hominum Phaisaico ingenio preditorum. Dr. Ames Cas. Consil. li. 5. ca. 11. thes. 12. in matters not intrinsically evill, we must not redeme the scandal of some, by giving greater scandal to others, and moe; or, in putting off necessary duties: nor must we doe evill, to shunne the appearance of it<sup>c</sup>.

As for Christian libertie, in things indifferent, it is not infringed by restraining the exercise or vse, but the judgement and conscience<sup>d</sup> thereof. Otherwise no State, Church, or Governour shall haue any power left them to command, or forbid the vse of any thing indifferent, but they shall trench upon Christian libertie; then which, nothing can bee said more unsound; nor many things, more perilous.

<sup>a</sup> Libertatem conscientiarum non impedi agnoscamus, quia non ipsa, sed tantum opus externum ligatur cum rerum mediarum usus coercetur per legem aliquam politicam vel constitutionem Ecclesiasticam. Profess. Leidenses. Synopsi Pugn. Theolog. Disput. 35. Thes. 39.

FINIS.

DISPUTATIONE VNGVENSIS  
CHOLERA VERA:

Quam

**SOLO DEO IUVANTE.**

Ex autoritate & decreto D. Magnifici Rectoris RUDOLPHI  
SNELLII, nec non reverendi Senatus Academicorum  
amplissimæq; facultatis Medicæ consensu,

Pro Gradu Doctoratus in Medicina obtinendo  
discutiendæ proponit

IOANNES BURGESVS Anglo-Britannus.

Ad diem 27. Augusti, Anno 1619. C. XI..



Lugduni Batavorum,

Excudebat THOMAS BASSON, 1619.